

incorporate The Military Order of the Purple Heart, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

#### ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF UNOBTAINED-TO BILLS ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate meets tomorrow it proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to state also in that connection that, under the assumption that we shall finish the call of the calendar tomorrow, it will be my purpose then to move a recess until Monday, so that we will not have a Saturday session.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of Edward Millard Bryan, of Idaho, to be United States marshal for the district of Idaho, vice George A. Meffan, deceased.

Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the following nominations:

Bernard J. Flynn, of Maryland, to be United States attorney for the district of Maryland; and

August Klecka, of Maryland, to be United States marshal for the district of Maryland.

Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the following nominations:

Bower Broadbuss, of Oklahoma, to be district judge for the eastern, northern, and western districts of Oklahoma, vice Alfred P. Murrah (elevated to the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit); and

Royce H. Savage, of Oklahoma, to be district judge for the northern district of Oklahoma, vice Franklin E. Kennamer, retired.

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of several postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

#### POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, except that of Anna M. Brewster to be postmaster at East Islip, N. Y.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, with the exception of the nomination mentioned by the Senator from Tennessee, which will be passed over, the remaining nominations of postmasters on the calendar are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

#### RETURN OF THREE CONVENTIONS TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the following request of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] in regard to a number of conventions on the Executive Calendar be read from the desk and that the request made by the Senator from Nevada be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent request will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Foreign Relations at its meeting on September 24, 1940, authorized and directed its chairman to recommend that the Senate return three conventions to the Secretary of State, without the advice and consent of the Senate to their ratification, in view of the political changes effected through military operations in Europe since these conventions were signed. Two of these conventions, Executive A, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, and Executive I, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, were previously approved by the Committee on Foreign Relations and are now on the Executive Calendar of the Senate. The other convention, Exec-

utive H, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, has not been considered by the committee. These conventions are as follows:

Executive A, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, a convention between the United States of America and France, signed at Paris on July 25, 1939, for the avoidance of double taxation and the establishment of rules of reciprocal administrative assistance in the case of income and other taxes, and a protocol signed on the same day which is made an integral part thereof.

Executive H, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, a convention between the United States of America and Norway, signed at Washington on March 28, 1940, providing for the disposition of a claim of the Government of Norway against the Government of the United States on behalf of Christoffer Hannevig, a Norwegian subject, and a claim of the Government of the United States against the Government of Norway on behalf of the late George R. Jones, an American citizen.

Executive I, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, a convention between the United States of America and Lithuania defining the duties, rights, privileges, exemptions, and immunities of consular officers of each country in the territory of the other country, which was signed at Washington, May 10, 1940.

I ask unanimous consent that these conventions be returned to the Secretary of State as above set forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I wish to ask whether any of these conventions are on the Executive Calendar?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the first one is on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The parliamentarian advises the Chair that two of the conventions are on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. AUSTIN. The other is not?

Mr. BARKLEY. The other is not. The committee yesterday unanimously authorized the proposed action because of the situation which makes the treaties inappropriate now.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request made by the Senator from Nevada is agreed to.

#### RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, September 27, 1940, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 26 (legislative day of September 18), 1940*

#### POSTMASTERS

##### NEW YORK

Jay Stafford, Red Creek.

Ward Kilpatrick, Windsor.

##### VIRGINIA

Wallace J. Dyar, Skyland.

##### WASHINGTON

Carl S. Halverson, Bremerton.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 1940

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Father in heaven, give us today the joy of happy hearts moving in the right direction. Create in us the splendor that dawns when we are brotherly, kind, and benevolent and know not station, race, nor creed. Deepen our spirits to receive Thy grace and make us eager to hear the voice in which duty compels and our country commands us. Inspire us to understand more of our own selves with their possible enrichments of aspirations, heroisms, and dreams. Building a very definite altar in our breasts, may we be rich in godliness lest we be the stricken children of time, whirled hither and thither by the merciless winds of fate and chance. Gracious Lord, we praise Thee for Thy wisdom and patience, for Thy

power and love; yea, more than these for Him who is the bread, the water, and the light of life. In His holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 10295. An act to amend the act of June 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 944); and

H. R. 10405. An act to provide for adjusting the compensation of persons employed as masters-at-arms and guards at navy yards and stations, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9722. An act to provide for the regulation of the business of fire, marine, and casualty insurance, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. TOBEY members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Commerce.
3. Department of Labor.
4. Department of State.
5. Department of the Treasury.
6. Department of War.
7. Federal Trade Commission.
8. Work Projects Administration.

#### ELECTION OF MAJORITY LEADER, HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PARSONS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic caucus, I officially announce to the House the election as majority leader of the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts. [Applause, the Members rising.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD my own remarks concerning the accomplishments and achievements of the Honorable James A. Farley, and to insert therein several magazine articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAVAGAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include a speech delivered by the late Champ Clark, of Missouri.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GUYER]?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] was so kind as to courteously salute me as I went to the pressroom. May I say for the benefit of the House that this esteemed gentleman is rather coy and retiring and I think the House should have the benefit of recognized genius, such as the gentleman recognizes in him-

self. I want to say that the gentleman has written a book. It shows how easily one can wrong a colleague. I thought probably he had help in writing the book, but I read the book and am now convinced that he did not have any help.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a portion of a report made to the mayor of the city of New York on industrial mobilization in connection with New York City.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY]?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we want to be careful that we do not get into war. I read from an editorial:

Another sharp statement registering Secretary of State Hull's disapproval of Japan makes United States-Japanese relations a little worse than before. This time Mr. Hull, who, of course, is the Roosevelt administration's official mouthpiece in affairs like this, objects to Japan's grab at French Indochina.

What moral objection there can be to the grab escapes us. France grabbed Indochina in 1863, after 30 years of off-and-on warfare between the natives and French missionaries backed by French soldiers. France is now three-fifths occupied by the Germans, and the Government of the other two-fifths of France has consented to the Japanese Indochina grab.

Yet Mr. Hull complains that the Far East's "status quo is being upset. \* \* \* Under duress." What business is that of ours? What duty have we to preserve the status quo in the Far East?

Mr. Speaker, if we do not watch out we will be at war with somebody that we do not want to be at war with in Asia or in Europe. Anyone wanting a fight can get it if he does not keep his nose out of the other fellow's business. I say to America and American citizens, if you do not watch out your President and elected officials will get us into actual war. Nothing worse can happen to America at this time. Write the President to keep his fingers and nose out of other people's business, especially in Asia and Europe.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL-DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1941

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 10572) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2982), which was read a first and second time, and with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Gross]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, we have labored long and hard here and we are all entitled to a day off. While we cannot afford to recess and go home, we can take a day off and drive over here about 100 miles into York County, Pa., next week to the county fair.

There you will see fine farms, fine farm products, the best livestock in America and the finest fruit that grows. It is a great country and it is going to be a great fair. That county fair is better and bigger than most of the State fairs and on next Thursday there will be 130,000 or 150,000 people there. I want to invite the entire membership of the House over there next week and we will show you just what we Pennsylvania Dutch people do when we make up our minds. At the head of that association is our Lieutenant Governor, Samuel



S. Lewis, who is widely known throughout the country. Under his leadership that fair has been developed. He is, by the way, a Republican. It was on this fair ground where 30 years ago President Theodore Roosevelt said, "I am proud of your fair, of your big barns, and happy to know that every fall you have them full." No one thought at that time that 30 years later another Roosevelt would come along with a communistic Secretary of Agriculture like Wallace and tell us that we dare not fill these barns. But we fill them regardless.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PIERCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on August 24 the gentleman from Georgia placed in the RECORD a list of naval construction. I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a statement of construction by the Army that appears on page 66 of the hearings on the supplemental defense bill, with reference to Army construction, similar to the one that was placed in the RECORD with reference to the naval construction.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with the remarks I expect to make on the appropriation bill to be considered today I may include certain excerpts from a statement by General Herr, Chief of Cavalry, made to the appropriations subcommittee for the War Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following the legislative program of the day and after any other special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

## OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE ADVISERS

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely appreciate the advertising that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama, gave my new book, *The Challenge of 1940*, published by G. P. Putnam Sons, of New York. You can buy it at the leading newsstands. Again, I thank the gentleman for so kindly mentioning my book in his 1-minute speech.

Let me speak now about our national defense advisers.

Everywhere throughout the country men and women who pride themselves on their willingness to see both sides of the question express their admiration of the personnel of our National Defense Advisory Commission. The quiet manner in which it has gone to work, the many evidences of its willingness to devote itself conscientiously to the problems before it, the untold hours of labor which members of the Commis-

sion are voluntarily expending, all these things have given the Commission a great opportunity to win public favor and to perform an historically important job.

Yet despite the efforts of Knudsen, Stettinius, and Hillman, the basic problem has gone unsolved. The President of the United States has seen fit to retain within himself the complete control of the Commission. Repeated requests that a chairman be appointed, voiced by citizens no less public spirited than the President himself, have fallen upon deaf ears. Yet every man and woman who belongs to any organization knows that every organization must have a directing force to push its work. Without a chairman, without a coordinator, men work at cross purposes. They turn in performances of notable value, individually, and yet they may snarl the entire procedure.

Our Advisory Commission stands in grave danger of precisely this trouble. There is no reason whatever why a chairman should not be appointed who would in turn be directly accountable to the President for the activities of the group.

It is simply one additional illustration of the desire of the President to retain within his own hands the complete direction of every one of the multiple activities which he seeks to control.

One-man government is not a remote consideration when the defense of the Nation is so handled. There is serious danger that this one-man government is already here. We cannot risk this kind of danger. [Applause.]

## SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## House Resolution 616

*Resolved*, That the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 282 of the Seventy-fifth Congress and continued under House Resolution 26, Seventy-sixth Congress, and House Resolution 321, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, incurred by the special committee appointed to investigate un-American propaganda in the United States and related questions, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$35,000 in addition to sums heretofore made available, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on Accounts, and the amount herein appropriated is to cover all expenditures of said committee of every nature in the final completion of its investigation and filing its report not later than January 3, 1941.

SEC. 2. That the official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia if not otherwise officially engaged.

SEC. 3. The head of each executive department is hereby requested to detail to said special committee such number of legal and expert assistants and investigators as said committee may from time to time deem necessary.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution was introduced in the absence of the chairman by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES], a member of the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities. This committee will be in existence for the remainder of this Congress. Its funds now available will soon be exhausted. The amount provided in this resolution will enable the committee to carry on the same as they have carried on for the last 4 or 5 months, and then have a small surplus over that amount. The Congress created the committee, and this is the fourth appropriation we have made.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. How much have we appropriated for this committee?

Mr. COCHRAN. The original appropriation was \$25,000, in the Seventy-fifth Congress. There was later a \$100,000 appropriation, and then there was a \$75,000 appropriation, \$200,000 in all. This amount will bring it to \$235,000, and is the largest amount that has ever been given to an investigating committee of this House in the 14 years I have been a member of the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. RICH. I believe that even though we spend \$200,000, if the result has been to bring to light un-American activities and people have been forced to discontinue such activities, it is the cheapest money we have ever spent.

Mr. COCHRAN. I think everyone will agree with that statement.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman will yield me some time.

Mr. COCHRAN. The committee has unanimously agreed on the resolution, and the Chair has asked me to expedite the matter, as there is an important appropriation to be considered. I am willing to answer any question the gentleman wants to ask.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I may have a number of questions to ask, and I do not want to burden the gentleman with all these questions.

Mr. COCHRAN. The Chair recognized me in the belief that the matter could be expedited. I shall have to move the previous question at the earliest possible moment. If the gentleman wants to ask a question, I am willing to answer it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. What evidence has the committee presented of how it has disposed of the other moneys, and why does the committee need this \$35,000 for the remaining 3 months of this Congress?

Mr. COCHRAN. That is all a matter of record. The vouchers have been filed, duly signed by the chairman. The committee is functioning and will have little left of the present appropriation after the first of the month.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. What evidence has been before the Committee on Accounts to justify making available another \$35,000?

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman knows that the Accounts Committee is an agent of the House. The Accounts Committee did not create this special committee. When the House creates a committee it is the duty of the Accounts Committee to provide money for its operation. A proper showing was made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES], and based on that showing, your committee unanimously voted the additional amount, \$35,000.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. KRAMER. When this resolution came before the committee some 2 weeks ago, at the request of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], he asked for \$25,000. At that meeting, after hearing the comments, I moved to increase the amount to \$50,000. My reason for such a move was that the gentleman from Texas had been in Los Angeles and San Francisco and had made statements to the press that unless he received an additional appropriation of \$100,000 he could not carry on the work he had carved out to do. Subsequent to that time, I understand, he said that he could get along with \$35,000. I understand from the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] that that is all the money the committee will need to carry on the work which has been set out by the committee to do, so that if there is any further work to be done in California or anywhere else it will be taken care of out of this appropriation. May I ask the gentleman from Alabama if that is correct?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Insofar as we can foresee, that is correct. Thirty-five thousand dollars is probably the amount we can expeditiously and judiciously spend between now and the 1st of January.

Mr. KRAMER. In other words, I want the committee and the House to know that it is through no fault of this committee or mine that he is being hindered from carrying on the investigation.

Mr. RABAUT. If the gentleman will yield, I want to say to the gentleman that I am surprised at his statement, because 2 years ago, when the chairman of the committee, Mr. DIES, came in and got additional money, he came up to Detroit shortly after that and all he did was to smear the

Democratic candidate, Frank Murphy, who was seeking reelection as Governor.

Mr. KRAMER. I do not know what he did in Michigan, but he said he had to have this money to complete the investigation, and I do not want to be recognized as one who wants to stop the work now.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. As a matter of fact, if this resolution does not pass, the work of the Dies committee will have to cease. Is not that correct?

Mr. COCHRAN. That is correct. The life of the committee runs until January 1 and this amount will enable them to continue their activities.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### HOUSING FOR SELECTIVE SERVICE TRAINEES

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, September 14, the President transmitted to Congress estimates for providing housing for selective-service trainees.

Under the terms of the Selective Training and Service Act no person may be inducted for training and service until shelter, water, heating and lighting, hospitalization, and so forth, shall have been adequately and appropriately provided. The urgency of the provision of such facilities, therefore, is plainly manifest.

Our late Speaker died early on the morning of September 15. Business on September 16, 17, and 18 was suspended on account of his funeral.

At 10 o'clock on Thursday morning, September 19, the House Committee on Appropriations met to consider the President's estimates, submitted on Saturday, September 14.

General Marshall at that meeting was asked if the urgency of the housing matter warranted separate action and he told the committee that every day counted. He said the expediting of the availability of funds for shelter was of tremendous importance to the War Department.

Accordingly the committee drafted and presented to the House when it met on Thursday a resolution appropriating the money for the housing and accessory construction and facilities. The resolution was passed promptly, and on the following day, September 20, the resolution was passed by the Senate without change and sent to the White House for the President's approval. The resolution was written in the language and in the amount of his estimate, so, therefore, there was no excuse for delay in approval.

My information is that the resolution received the President's approval Tuesday the 24th. The resolution passed Friday and was immediately sent to the President and the resolution was not approved until Tuesday, although General Marshall stated that every day counted.

I want the responsibility for the delay to be placed where it properly belongs.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to insert a resolution of the Polish Veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### FILING OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON TAX BILL

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight Saturday night to file a conference report on the tax bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.



## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by Hon. Donald Comer, consultant to Hon. Chester C. Davis, member of the National Defense Advisory Board, delivered before the Agricultural Committee of the United States Chamber of Commerce in session at Washington, on September 26, 1940, on the subject of Decentralization of Defense Industries.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

## THE POLICY OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to remind the House of the extremely untenable position of the State Department regarding the Far East. Their position passeth all understanding. We have had neutrality legislation on our books. It was never enforced when clearly Japan was at war with China, and this administration has steadily shipped arms, munitions, and commodities of war to Japan with which to hurt China, and, today, the administration decides it will help China. It is an extremely vacillating and untenable and a very dangerous policy that is being pursued by the Department of State. It is just as much an undeclared war as it was a number of years ago.

## THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1941

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10572) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes; and, pending that, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue not to exceed 2 hours, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 10572, the third supplemental national defense appropriation bill, 1941, with Mr. GAVAGAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes. The estimates considered in connection with the bill under consideration amount to \$1,325,452,074, apart from contractual authority of \$158,500,000, and a reappropriation of \$17,790,292.

As submitted by the committee, the bill carries appropriations, reappropriations, and contractual authority in those amounts with the exception of \$13,958,438 subtracted at the instance of the Bureau of the Budget because of funds improperly included in the estimates for pay of Army, Marine Corps, and National Guard enlisted personnel.

Of the total amount proposed, the Army's portion is \$1,250,792,636, and 85 percent of that amount is before us by reason

of the act recently passed providing for calling the National the Officers' Reserve Corps into active military service, and of the Selective Service and Training Act of 1940, passed just a Guard, retired officers of the Regular Army, and officers of short time back.

In consequence of such legislation, it is the plan of the War Department to bring into the service during the remainder of the current fiscal year a total of 1,024,441 men, such number being in addition to the force of 375,000 Regulars heretofore appropriated for.

The division of such augmentation between National Guard men and selective trainees will depend upon, first, the result of the effort being made to recruit the National Guard to peace strength—328,451; second, the result of the effort being made to recruit to full strength the appropriated-for force of Regulars—375,000; and third, the extent to which volunteers may be inducted into the service after the selection procedure shall have become operative.

Under the terms of the bill the number of selective trainees cannot exceed 800,000.

The officers for the expanded force will come very largely from the Officers' Reserve Corps. The estimates contemplate that from time to time during the remainder of the current fiscal year a total of 42,262 officers of such component will be called to active duty.

The whole amount in the accompanying bill by reason of personnel expansion is \$1,062,976,496. The major expense items will be found enumerated on page 4 of the committee's report.

In addition to the personnel expansion provided for under the laws I have mentioned, we include under the Army head \$36,444,640 for increasing from 7,000 to 12,000 the Army's pilot-training program, that sum applying to pay, travel, organizational, individual, and instructional equipment, tuition at flying schools, acceleration of technical training, and motor vehicles.

Another large item under the Army subdivision of the bill pertains to the expedition of aviation production. We include \$150,000,000 of appropriation and \$150,000,000 of contractual authority for expediting airplane production. Sixty million dollars of the appropriation and \$60,000,000 of the contractual authority is carried under the Air Corps head. Such portion is for accelerating deliveries, including raw materials, and for the added cost incident to overtime and increased shifts. The \$180,000,000 of appropriation and contractual authority separately carried under the head of "Expediting production" is to meet the cost of additional production facilities, to be expended upon the recommendation of the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense, with the approval of the President. The entire amount has been urged upon the committee as being essential to the rapid production of planes heretofore appropriated for and, it follows, of potential programs of the same or greater magnitude.

The remaining principal proposal touching the Army has to do with the operation and maintenance of the selective-service system; that is, with administering the Selective Service and Training Act. For that purpose we recommend the Budget estimate of \$24,825,108. You will find the details on pages 5 and 6 of our report.

The appropriations for the comparable World War activity aggregated \$54,896,903. Total expenditures, taking into account items of expense separately financed, ran well in excess of that sum; for example, the pay of a very considerable number of soldiers who were used in assignments it is now contemplated to fill with civilians; travel of draftees, which it is now contemplated to charge to the selective-training system, and certain expenses for printing. Furthermore, it is the understanding of the committee that the States bore a considerable portion of the expense under the former draft law, which it is now contemplated will be borne by the Government.

The records of the former experience were carefully studied in shaping the estimates and an examination of the supporting data presented to the committee, wherein comparisons

are drawn, would seem to justify an appropriation in the amount requested and recommended.

Under the Navy title of the bill you will find a considerably smaller supplemental appropriation. The total, including \$8,500,000 of contractual authority, is \$69,201,000. That amount principally falls under three heads. Under Ordnance, \$9,000,000 is provided for additional facilities for the manufacture of antiaircraft guns, and \$27,000,000 is provided for keeping aviation ordnance in step with the Navy's airplane procurement program.

Under the Bureau of Aeronautics we provide an additional amount of \$15,000,000 for expansion of the aircraft-manufacturing industry. There has been appropriated previously under the Navy for this purpose \$45,000,000. This program is under the direction of the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense, which has just completed a resurvey of production facilities, and has found further expansion essential to an early productive capacity of 36,000 airplanes per year. The additional amount represents the Navy's share. There is included in the War Department title of the bill, as I previously have stated, \$180,000,000, one-half being by way of contractual authority, for like employment.

Lastly, under Public Works, we include \$6,500,000 to enable the Navy to build a large graving drydock in the New York area, sufficiently large to accommodate any naval vessel built, building, or at this time projected, and also toward the acquisition of a supply depot at Bayonne, N. J., represented to be badly needed because of congestion of present facilities in that area. Contractual authority on account of these two projects is \$8,500,000.

So much for the bill. I should like now to give you a summation of the things that are being accomplished with the defense funds we have made available for the present fiscal year.

Assuming the instant bill becomes law carrying the appropriations and contractual authority recommended by the committee, the Congress will have made available to the Army and Navy for the fiscal year 1941 a total of \$8,334,700,507 by way of immediate appropriation, and \$3,802,132,009 by way of contractual authority. The grand total would be \$12,136,832,516.

That sum excludes commitments sanctioned for constructing approximately 349 naval ships, excluding a number of small patrol craft, the total estimated cost of which, exclusive of the added expense attendant upon emergency construction, has been represented to be \$4,734,051,880. Less than \$148,000,000 of that amount has been appropriated directly for initiating this program.

The principal purposes to be served by all of this money that Congress has voted are as follows:

#### PERSONNEL

Raise enlisted strength of Regular Army from 227,000 to 375,000. Those numbers include the Philippine Scouts.

Raise strength of National Guard (officers and men) from 210,000 to 346,130, and employ on active military service.

Induction and training of a minimum of 695,990 selective trainees.

Increase Army Reserve officers on extended active duty from 3,555 to 55,592.

Raise enlisted strength of the Navy from 145,000 to 170,000, including 10,000 naval reservists to volunteer for active duty.

Increase Naval Reserve officers on extended active duty from 853 to 3,269, plus 5,000 Reserve midshipmen.

Increase Naval Reserve men on extended active duty from 436 to 628, plus 5,351 additional reservists in training as student pilots.

Raise enlisted strength of Marine Corps from 25,000 to 34,000.

Increase Marine Corps Reserve officers on extended active duty from 214 to 252.

House, clothe, subsist, pay, and train these expanded forces, including augmented training for forces in existence prior to expansion.

Increase pilot training and develop enlisted airplane mechanics.

#### MATÉRIEL

Provide for completely equipping with essential items (items normally produced commercially) the protective mobilization plan force (1,400,000 men) and to maintain that force on a combat status.

Provide all reserve stocks of the critical items of supplies (semiautomatic rifles, antitank guns, tanks, light and heavy artillery, ammunition, gas masks, etc.) needed to equip a ground force of 2,000,000 men.

Provide the Army with a force of 25,000 and the Navy with a force of 10,000 serviceable airplanes.

Begin the construction of 292 combatant naval vessels and 57 auxiliary ships.

Recondition decommissioned naval vessels and acquire and convert auxiliary ships.

Provide additional production facilities, including new plants and extension of existing plants for accelerating immediate programs and to supply potential continued and augmented demands.

Establish and develop new Army and Navy air bases and stations.

Provide for many and varied collateral expenses in connection with all of the foregoing, not heretofore mentioned, including aviation facilities and storage.

The President, in his selective-service proclamation of September 16, 1940, stated that—

We must and will marshal our great potential strength to fend off war from our shores. We must and will prevent our land from becoming a victim of aggression.

That statement well summarizes the object of the vast outlays going into the purposes just enumerated. So far as the committee is advised, the measure now under consideration, in conjunction with those which have gone before, goes as far in the marshaling process as is considered feasible and practicable at this time by our military and naval leadership.

Mr. Chairman, as far as we know, the passage of this bill will complete the appropriations at this session of Congress and will complete providing funds for the defense program up to date. If this bill becomes law substantially in its present form, as I have previously stated, we will have appropriated for the defense program \$12,136,832,516. These funds are appropriated for the purpose of providing total hemispheric defense. If we get value for our money and if we get hemispheric defense, the Government will have secured a great bargain.

We might as well face realities. Further large appropriations are going to be required if we continue the policy of providing for an army of 1,400,000, a two-ocean navy, and all of the other complements that go with that sort of a defense program, together with the bases for aviation and for the Navy. I believe that certainly an overwhelming majority of the Members of the House feel that a total defense program which will give America an impregnable military defense is necessary. [Applause.] I believe the American people concur in that thought. I feel that the legislative branch of the Government has cooperated with the President in making available the necessary legislation and the necessary funds to carry out that sort of program.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] just a few moments ago undertook, I am afraid, in commenting upon the fact that there had been no director of national defense appointed, to draw some political implications from the defense activities, which is most unfortunate. That is a strange insistence to be coming from the minority side of the House, which has so frequently inveighed against dictatorship and expressed itself as being favorable to democratic processes. If the President should tomorrow name Bill Jones or Sam Smith or anybody else administrator of defense and give him sweeping authority over this defense program, I can imagine that the gentleman from Ohio, among others in this body, would make the welkin ring in reminding us of the fact that their dread threats of dictatorship were coming to pass.

There is not one scintilla of evidence or one possible ground to make a statement that the Advisory Commission on Defense is under the control of anybody. Mr. Knudsen has



never made any such statement. Mr. Stettinius has never made any such statement. On the contrary, repeatedly before the Appropriations Committee of the House they have said in response to direct questions by myself that they had been given absolutely a free hand in the operations and in the tasks given to them to undertake to mobilize industry and to prepare for the Army and Navy the materials they needed in this program.

I believe the Congress and the administration have provided in a conscientious and in a sincere way for the defense of America. Aside from little sporadic outbursts here and there of some overzealous partisan who would undertake to drag politics into it, and those instances are rather rare, the effort has been a nonpartisan effort. I do not recall of a single instance where any gentleman on the Republican side, either in the committee or in the House, has undertaken to cut any of these defense estimates or even to increase them. I am not speaking of the other ordinary expenses of government, but of the defense estimates.

I want to say for the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and other minority members upon the appropriations deficiency committee, which has handled most of these defense items, that they have cooperated in a splendid, patriotic manner. We have endeavored to inquire as minutely as possible into the justification for these items, and we have given to the Congress and to the country the best estimates that could be given of a gigantic program of this kind in advance.

Now, this should be said: Providing for this defense program is entirely different from the ordinary routine process of providing for the regularly established operating Government departments. Our subcommittees can take the Post Office Department or the Interior Department or any other department and, because of the experience we have had year after year in providing for their wants, we can examine their estimates, and we can form a pretty clear idea of whether they are excessive, whether they are unduly expanded, whether they are wise expenditures. Not so with this defense program. Here we are dealing almost with an unknown quantity. To me it has been most satisfactory and rather amazing that the Army and the Navy have been able to come before our committee with as much minute detail and with as many definite and specific estimates as they have been able to present. I am confident that when we have had experience in this defense program we will find many points where perhaps we have been too liberal. There undoubtedly will be other points where insufficient funds have been provided. But we have brought here the very best estimates as the result of the very best consideration that could be given these matters in advance of their operation.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MAY. I am sure the gentleman will be glad to know that the House Military Affairs Committee, conscious of its responsibility, has today heard General Marshall for more than an hour and a half on the question of personnel set-up of the Army under this program, and I am quite sure that every member of that committee, including the minority members, were extremely satisfied with the explanation that he made of how the thing is being done. Tomorrow we will hear from Admiral Stark on the subject of the procurement features of it. What we are trying to do is to be sure that the thing is being done right. And I want to say now that General Marshall convinced that committee this morning that he is a great general to be in charge of the whole thing and is doing a good job.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am very glad to have that statement from the gentleman from Kentucky. I agree with the gentleman that General Marshall, as Chief of Staff, and Admiral Stark, as Chief of Naval Operations, are two splendidly qualified men to handle the program. I do not know where you could find in the service two more splendidly qualified men to handle these important duties. [Applause.]

That brings me to this point.

In providing for this defense program Congress has done its part, but its duties have not ceased. A tremendous duty is going to continue upon the legislative branch by what is going to follow these expenditures and follow these programs. The responsibility rests upon the two subcommittees of the House Appropriations Committee, those for the War Department and the Navy Department, when they come to consider their annual bills, to take these tremendous sums that have been provided and see to it that we get the things we have bargained for.

Let me say this by way of general observation on the subject of defense: Any defense program for America that rests itself entirely upon military preparedness and contents itself in feeling that we have preserved democracy by providing an army and a navy, will awaken one day sadly to realize that we have overlooked perhaps the front-line trenches, and that is the economic feature involved. [Applause.]

I am not worried today about the military defense of the Western Hemisphere. Almighty God in His providence has given us time to provide that and we shall have time to provide that, but I am looking forward a little bit today—and I challenge the membership of this House to look a little bit ahead—to the day when the war clouds begin to roll muttering away, when the nations of the earth bled white and tired, and weary of fighting—when most of the young men have all been buried beneath the sod and only old men and old women, very largely, have been left all over the Continent of Europe, when fields are no longer ripe with harvest but crusted with the dried blood of men whose lives have been sacrificed to the god of war, the day when men lay down their guns by the millions and millions and turn wearily back to the sad tortuous process of taking up and undertaking to rehabilitate the economic life of the world. What sort of world are we going to be living in? Where is America going to be in that day? Perhaps we shall come to think then again as we did after the World War that we should demobilize some of our defense forces. Undoubtedly, having made as many fighting planes as we shall need, having provided as many tanks as we shall need, having stored underground in safe vaults as much ammunition as we shall need, undoubtedly we shall begin to demobilize our industrial plants. Where shall we be then? Where will our economy in America be then? For the next few years we are going to have a period of great industrial activity, almost of boom-time proportions. There will be work to be done; in fact, there is so much work to be done today that we do not have the trained men to do it but have to speed up programs to train men to do this necessary work.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

But when this period of demobilization comes, when Europe demobilizes and America slumps off, I pose to you my friends from districts largely populated by laboring men—I pose to you my friends who pride yourselves upon your interest in agriculture: What jobs are you going to provide for these millions of men who will lay down their guns, for these millions of men who are turned out of the munitions factories and airplanes factories? They having been turned out, and out of employment, what provision are you going to make, my agricultural friends, for someone to purchase the products of the farm?

Oh, my fellow Members of the House of Representatives, the staggering problem that comes today to the people of America is where are we going to be and what is going to be the economy of America in that sad day, that tragic day? And as I read the debates in the public press and in the public forum I am not heartened very much. I find largely they are taken up with commonplace things, wisecracks, trite statements, cheap bids for political support; but the serious problem that thunders to America today and to the Western Hemisphere, the great problem that lies upon your doorstep, is: How are you going to maintain the American way of life and the American standard of living when this day comes? I do not know the answer; I do not pretend to know it. If

any other man in public life knows it, he has been careful to keep it a secret, because we do not find it being discussed today. But I have digressed too much.

We are interested today in putting the finishing touches on military preparedness. We have done that. The legislative branch of the Government has provided what the Commander in Chief has said he needed; that recommendation echoed and supplemented by the advice of experts and concurred in by the advice of industrial leaders. No one can do more than that. With that program I am satisfied. With the economic outlook I am terrified. [Applause.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill calls for \$1,313,493,633 of direct appropriations and \$158,500,000 of contract authorizations. Previous bills together with this one provide \$5,702,000,000 of direct appropriations and \$2,979,000,000 of contract authorizations for the Army and for the Navy \$2,611,811,068 of direct appropriations and \$822,995,612 of contract authorizations, making a total of \$8,333,000,000 of direct appropriations and \$3,800,000,000 in contract authorizations. I shall put that in the RECORD in the form of a table.

Total appropriations for 1941 defense, including this bill

	Direct appropriations	Authorizations
War Department.....	\$5,720,679,731	\$2,979,136,397
Navy.....	2,631,811,068	822,995,612
Total.....	8,352,490,799	3,802,132,009
Grand total.....		12,155,622,808

It calls for the appropriation of everything that the War Department and the Navy Department have asked us for through the Budget that they had any reason to expect. The items that have been deducted from all of these bills have been items that after the hearings the War Department or the Navy Department admitted they could get along without.

These bills call for paying the money to bring into service the men who will be drawn under the Draft Act which was passed and became a law a week ago last Saturday. This is the occasion for the putting into effect of the Draft Act. In other words, the Draft Act is not effective until these appropriations are passed insofar as the calling out of troops is concerned. The number provided for I shall put in the RECORD.

The total National Guard and draft men called out will run something like 55,000 to 60,000 per month beginning the middle of September and running through the middle of November, a total for that purpose of approximately 165,000 or 170,000, through the middle of November. The total in December will be small, something like 44,000. I will put those figures in the RECORD. After January the number will run something like two-hundred-and-thirteen-thousand-odd. In other words, the Army is not figuring on having the National Guard or those who are drafted called out until after sufficient, satisfactory housing and hospitalization facilities are provided for all those who might be called out.

This table represents the monthly addition to troops:

	Cantonments	Tents	Total
Sept. 15, 1940.....	30,443	26,996	57,439
Oct. 15, 1940.....	5,808	52,275	58,083
Nov. 15, 1940.....	6,283	50,831	57,114
Dec. 15, 1940.....	37,086	7,596	44,682
After Jan. 1, 1941.....	196,109	17,053	213,162

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman explain to us what the relationship is between the \$303,000,000 in this bill for housing construction and so on and what I thought was an appropriation that we passed in a single bill a few days ago for the same purpose?

Mr. TABER. There is no item in here for housing. That was all included in the bill previously passed. If the gentleman

will look at page 12 of the report he will see the breakdown. The item for construction at military posts is \$29,000,000, and I have not that in my head at the moment. I will put what that is for in the RECORD. That item goes toward cost of temporary housing of troops. For barracks and quarters there are \$33,000,000 and the \$1,729,000 relates to items of construction other than those that are required for the draftees and the National Guard as well as for items of a less urgent variety than those temporary set-ups. There was \$338,000,000 included in one way or the other in the bill that was passed last Thursday, if I remember correctly.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right. Is the \$303,000,000 on page 2 of the report a summation of the various items that the gentleman mentioned a moment ago?

Mr. TABER. That is a summation of what the Budget estimate was. The Budget estimate was separated into two bills, the one brought in last Thursday and this one.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I see. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Can the gentleman tell us how fast the enlistment is going on? I understand that the men are enlisting very fast and that the draft may not be necessary for some time.

Mr. TABER. I would not want to say anything about that. I understand, although I do not know, that there are many more enlistments going into the National Guard companies to fill up their peacetime quota which they are being asked to get as far as they can before they start. They are going beyond that if they can without too much solicitation. I understand the biggest part of the enlistments would come in those increments to the National Guard companies in the different localities and that the regular enlistments have been going along at such a rate that they will add about 15,000 net per month to the number in the Army. Of course, I have not the figures right up to date, but that is the general drift.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There were 40,000 in the month of August.

Mr. TABER. But not net. That was gross. The average over June, July, and August was about 15,000 net deducting the expirations.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understood it was something like 32,000.

Mr. TABER. It ran 15,000 net. That is a pretty good increase and is very satisfactory under any ordinary circumstances.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman has stated he is going to put the figures in the RECORD.

Mr. TABER. Of the increments.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Yes. The gentleman referred to an appropriation of \$8,000,000,000.

Mr. TABER. Eight billion plus of direct appropriations.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. And three billion of contract authorizations.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. To what period does that refer?

Mr. TABER. That is the total of appropriations and contract authorizations running through the period and includes funds that are made available either for direct expenditure or for contract authorizations during the fiscal year 1941.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman in preparing the tables show, if it is possible, how much of this was contemplated or taken care of up to, let us say, the Presidential message of May 16, and then, if possible, how much was



taken care of up to June 4, when the President said that we could go home? It would be most interesting and instructive if the gentleman would break down the figures to show what was proposed, and what we did up to the Presidential message, and then what was proposed, and what we did after the time the President said Congress was through for the year.

Mr. TABER. I believe I can give the gentleman that information very readily. Since we were told that we could go home on June 4 the Congress has had submitted to it and passed four major items and one minor item. There was \$1,300,000,000 in the first item that went through just before the 1st of July, \$5,300,000,000 in the one which went through rather currently, \$65,000,000 for the T. V. A., which went through the forepart of July, and \$338,000,000 which went through a week ago today. This item has a gross of approximately \$1,469,000,000. This includes the contract authorizations, and it makes a grand total of a little better than \$12,000,000,000 for funds available for 1941, including the Regular Army and Navy bills which were in contemplation on June 4.

Of the \$12,000,000,000 for 1941 over \$8,400,000,000 has been submitted by the President and considered by the Congress entirely since June 4.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am trying to reconcile the gentleman's figures with the figures of the Secretary of the Treasury on August 9. He put the figure of the total of appropriations and contract authorizations at \$14,402,000,000, I believe.

Mr. TABER. He probably included a lot of things that were appropriated for the fiscal year 1940, and probably was referring to a memorandum of what has been made available by this Congress, rather than for the fiscal year 1941. There probably was a mix-up there.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. He does not include in his estimate the appropriation before the House now.

Mr. TABER. No.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If I understood the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from New York correctly, this \$12,133,000,000 of direct appropriations and contract authorizations does not include the regular military and naval running appropriations.

Mr. TABER. No; I believe it does include that. It is my understanding that it is included in the \$12,000,000,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask the chairman of the committee if the \$12,133,000,000, in round figures, includes the regular annual running appropriations for the military and naval forces?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; it does not. That is the defense program. That is the added expansion on account of the so-called defense program.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask what is the rough figure we have provided?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If the gentleman will permit, I believe I will have to revise my statement. Refreshing my recollection by looking at the report on page 8, I see that we state:

Assuming the instant bill becomes law carrying the appropriations and contractual authority recommended by the committee, the Congress will have made available to the Army and Navy for the fiscal year 1941 a total of \$8,334,700,507 by way of immediate appropriation, and \$3,802,132,009 by way of contractual authority.

So, I believe it does carry the regular amount.

Mr. TABER. It does.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What I wanted to clear up for my own information and for the information of a lot of other people who are interested in it is this: We hear so much talk about this session of Congress having appropriated from \$12,000,000,000 to \$15,000,000,000 for national-defense pur-

poses. In other words, that \$15,000,000,000 figure is just about \$3,000,000,000 too much. Is that correct?

Mr. TABER. That includes the appropriations that were made available in 1940 and which were spent then. There was a very considerable item of that. I cannot give the figure offhand, but it runs over a billion dollars and might be over \$2,000,000,000. I would have to check up on that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. For the present fiscal year, the appropriations beginning last July 1 and ending June 30, 1941, we have provided direct appropriations and contract authorizations for the purchase of new plants, for the feeding of the conscripted Army we are to take in, and for the usual running expenses of the Army and Navy, in round figures \$12,133,000,000.

Mr. TABER. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That clears up the proposition.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That includes the contractual authorization, and in the amendments that were adopted to the Regular Establishment bill some of those appropriations were carried for approximately 2 years.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes; I understand that.

Mr. TABER. Out of the \$12,000,000,000 I would say that at least \$6,000,000,000 of that particular money cannot be paid out of the Treasury this fiscal year, whether it is appropriated or not.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I understand that.

Mr. TABER. That is contracted for. It will be paid out the following year.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That brings me to the next question I want to ask. What can the gentleman give us, as briefly as he wishes to make it, in the way of a rough figure that will be the running expenses, the recurring expenses of maintaining a million-man standing Army per annum? In other words, from next January to June we face a situation of appropriating money to take care of running needs of the increased Army. What would they run per annum, roughly?

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman mean a million men in the Army?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes; we have here, for instance, \$1,325,-000,000, we will say, in this particular bill.

We had before us the other day \$338,000,000, which was to provide for housing and hospital facilities. Let us assume that is a fixed purchase for plant, but I understand this bill is to cover primarily running expenses.

Mr. TABER. This bill would be primarily running expenses. There is probably a couple of hundred million dollars of nonrecurring items.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then should we assume that heretofore we have covered the usual running expenses of the Army, which included the upkeep, and now we bring in, roughly, \$1,325,000,000, which will be an additional recurring expense next year on the basis of a 1,000,000-man army, and which is an increase?

Mr. TABER. My own judgment is that the running expenses in peacetime of an army of 1,000,000 men would run not very far from \$2,000,000,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And that is to be something new which we have not heretofore carried in our Budget.

Mr. TABER. No; if we have had an army of 240,000 or something like that, three-fourths of that would be nearer.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me ask the gentleman another question. I was very much impressed with what the gentleman from Virginia had to say, and in my feeble way I have been trying to make the very approach that he pointed out, and in order to do that I have gone back and carefully reviewed in detail the economic history of Germany, for instance, since 1919, moving up through all the different steps they have taken with reference to inflation and revaluation and aski marks and exchange control, where they have tried

to fit themselves into the problem which the gentleman from Virginia was pointing out to us. It carries on through all the unemployment procedure on housing, public works, and agricultural relief that they followed and the way they have tried to build up and control exports and imports. We are all now facing the same situation. We have, in my opinion, practically adopted many of the so-called social reforms which the national socialism of Germany previously adopted. We did not until this year, as I visualize the situation, go into the rearmament program which Germany adopted in 1933.

Mr. TABER. Neither did we go to the 14-hour day.

Mr. CRAWFORD. No; in this step of rearmament we are virtually and in a fairly practical manner taking on the German national socialistic program with reference to defense and other social reforms and all that goes with that.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman call the 14-hour day and the 50-cents-a-day pay roll social reform?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman means in Germany?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That may also be ahead of us. In Germany they fix the hourly wage, they fix the prices on everything, and as I see the situation we will necessarily, by reason of our previous steps taken, move into the same zone when the time comes that you begin to break down this rearmament program and go back to a disarmament program, and I would like to ask the gentleman whether in the hearings which he had the privilege of attending in connection with the appropriations, if we go into those hearings in detail, will we find quite a bit of information along this line that will give us further light.

Mr. TABER. I do not think the gentleman will find anything in our hearings that will give him any picture of what our situation might be after we return to a peacetime basis. Everything that we have had has been directed toward finding out what are the needs of the country for immediate national defense, and that has been the limit of what we have been able to cover.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LEAVY. I notice in the hearings the gentleman did cause to be placed in the record certain facts and figures with reference to cost plus fixed fee, which figures appear on pages 66 and 67.

Mr. TABER. I have asked unanimous consent in the House that I may place that table in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that it may be available to Members just as the Vinson table was made available.

Mr. LEAVY. I think that information is invaluable and in the bill, at page 6, there is a proviso that the Secretary of War shall submit monthly, within 10 days following the last day of each month, commencing on or before November 10, 1940, to the respective chairmen of the Committees on Military Affairs and Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives a report of, first, all cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts concluded within the period embraced by each report, and so forth.

What I desire to ask the gentleman first is whether that report will be similar to the report that we find here in the hearings.

Mr. TABER. I would anticipate so, and while it is directed to be submitted to the chairman of the committee, I understand that it would not only be available to the membership of the committee, but also to the membership of the House, if they asked to see it.

Mr. LEAVY. That is exactly the information I wanted to get.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, apropos of what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] said today about his book, which I think I will buy [laughter and applause], I would like to say that you can get another book for a very small price over in the Government document room. I do not think it will cost you over 10 cents; maybe

less than that. It contains a report of all the work done by the House conference on unemployment. It contains a record of the thoughts and studies of a number of Members of this body on the central economic problem of this age. I would like to commend that little book to you. It was printed as a House document. We did not have very many copies of it printed, but we may get more if there is sufficient interest shown.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. In regard to this book and the committee's work in compiling it, I want to say that I was very happy to be a member of that committee. My trouble has been that I have been unable to get sufficient copies of the book at the document room. I wish there were some way that we might get more copies in order to send them out to our constituents. I think it contains a tremendous amount of valuable information; as the gentleman from California, chairman of the committee, who has worked so hard on it, has said, it is the result of an exhaustive study by those of us who have been here so long.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right. Of course, I would be glad to get some more copies, but I think it will require cooperation on the part of a number of Members to bring that about.

I listened with the utmost interest and with a very profound sense of obligation to what the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] said to the House this afternoon. I do not know that the gentleman from Virginia would agree with all of the views I entertain about what we need to do to face the problem that he posed for us, and in what I have to say in these few minutes I do not want to be understood as attempting to commit him to agreement with me. But I do want to say that I think he made perhaps the most significant speech that has been made in the House since this defense program was undertaken. I tried to make one yesterday afternoon when the House was in no mood to listen, in which I made some of the same points that the gentleman from Virginia made today.

For example, he said the responsibility of Congress is not discharged when it has passed appropriation bills for defense. He said Congress has done its job of providing the money necessary and the necessary legislative framework for the total defense of the Western Hemisphere, but that it is not through with the work it has to do. I agree with him completely.

Mr. Chairman, we are in a grave hour today. It is my humble judgment that the American people would be delighted at any political figure in this whole country, whether he be a candidate for high office or a humble Member of the House of Representatives, who actually and literally did turn politics aside for this period. I do not think it is a time when we can talk politics. I think it is a time when we have to go a lot deeper than that.

In my speech yesterday afternoon I said two things that I would like to read. First I said:

I think it is of basic importance that Congress does not get the idea that its job is done when it has appropriated money and passed bills for military defense.

Again I said this about the problem that the gentleman from Virginia presented to us, the problem that this Nation and every other Nation in the world is going to face when this period of so-called emergency is passed and when the people try to get back to what they will call "normal conditions," I expect. I said this:

We can do it. There is no question about that. The question is whether we want to badly enough. The question is whether we shall be content to see some portion of the unemployed go back to work because of our large armament expenditures and then fold our hands and await the economic whirlwind that is bound to come once those expenditures cease or are reduced. Or whether we will go to work earnestly and with determination to get at the root of the reason why our people cannot buy all they are so readily able to produce for sale.

Was there ever a time in the history of the United States when it was so evidently possible to get the cooperative



interest of practically every group of people in this Nation for the great problems that this country faces, as there is now? I do not believe there ever was. I think that the division between us in our political and economic thinking today is a division along the following lines: It is a division between those people who are going to be content to say that "Now we are going to have a boom. We are going to have better business. We are going to have somewhat of a reduction in unemployment. Things are going to be better, so why worry," on the one hand, and people on the other hand who are going to insist that we proceed now to a consideration of the continuing problem that we know is present and which has to be met in every nation in the world and which in some cases has only been met by sacrifices on the part of those peoples of their fundamental liberties and the establishment of a dictatorship.

Now is the time, as the gentleman from Virginia has so well stated, for us to consider these things and how we propose to face them.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let us take this one point, for instance: Here we put, say, 600,000 additional men under arms. What is to be done with reference to their social-security status in connection with the contributions they have made? Shall we freeze that into the proposition? You could raise any one of 50 questions that way.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is correct, and I should like to say to the gentleman that I understand an effort is being made to find the answer to and meet some of those matters in connection with the conference on the excess-profits tax bill. But I do not think that is the way to deal with them. I think we ought to stay here and consider it a week under a special bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with the gentleman entirely.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Certainly we should go very carefully into all questions that affect the lives of the men we draw to serve their Nation in a military capacity.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As was very pointedly said in connection with the tax bill, we fiddle around wasting time failing to pass the tax bill, the very lack of which is holding up the whole defense program. I think it is disgraceful action on the part of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to see the interests of every man who goes into military training taken care of, but I think it would be done much better in a separate bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to go ahead for a couple of minutes, if I may. I should like to illustrate briefly the point of the thing I am talking about.

On the matter of unemployment, one of these days I would like to have some time when I could summarize briefly the final report of our House conference on unemployment, but I am not going to speak about that now. I want to illustrate something from the standpoint of national defense. The people in all history who have been perhaps more devoted to their Nation than any other group of people in all society are the individual owners of a piece of the soil, the farmers who own their own farms. Unfortunately there have grown up in this country in the last 50 years forces tending to drive that man off his land and deprive him of the ownership thereof. I am not going into detail about what needs to be done to reverse that trend, but I am saying to you today that it is a problem the solution of which we certainly ought to undertake.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Insofar as you can reverse the tendency that now makes tenants out of owners or makes laborers out of owners and tenants and turn those forces back to the point where these men can become landowners again, you have done something for national defense of in-

calculable importance. National defense means the hearts and minds of the people. It means their devotion spontaneously to the thing that is their life. That is the illustration.

Now I want to say apropos of what the gentleman from Virginia said about the responsibility of Congress not having ended when you have appropriated money. I think—and I said on the floor the other day—that the House of Representatives ought at this time to set up a special committee to do one job today, and that job is to carry on a continuing review of the effectiveness of the expenditures of money for national-defense purposes. I propose this not because of lack of confidence in the National Defense Council, the President, or the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or anybody else, but because I think now is the time for the House of Representatives to recognize the fact that it must act with unusual speed in the passage of these measures; that we all know they have been passed carrying billions of dollars without opportunity for full consideration of what was going to happen to the money. The gentleman from Virginia himself pointed out the difference between these appropriations and appropriations for ordinary expenditures. Under these circumstances if a committee were given that responsibility it could, with the defense program proceeding full speed ahead, at the same time discharge as time went on a responsibility which it seems to me is a basic responsibility of the House of Representatives. I had opportunity this morning to speak before the Rules Committee about a resolution which I have introduced on this very purpose.

I conclude merely by saying, Mr. Chairman, that our job is not completed when we have appropriated the money and the means for national defense; it is only completed when we protect the economy and the people of America against this future impact that the gentleman from Virginia pointed out, and when we show the American people that we know what national defense really means.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Along the line of the gentleman's statement let me say to him that the Committee on Naval Affairs is following up each one of these authorizations that has been made to carry out the national-defense program. We are constantly checking up with the manufacturers and with the Navy Department to see that the intent of Congress is complied with as speedily as possible.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I have no doubt of that. My appeal is for a committee whose only job would be to do this one thing. It would not be busy with any other things as the gentleman's committee or the Appropriations Committee is bound to be.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, all of the items in this bill and all the items in future appropriation bills of this session, and there will be one more at least, providing money for the carrying out of the Conscription Act should be defeated and the act itself should be repealed before we adjourn. I base that statement on a change in international affairs. Within the past 2 weeks we agreed to the conference report on the conscription bill. The last argument was that England might fall any minute, then it would be too late for us, even if we adopted the Fish amendment postponing the whole thing 60 days. It would be too late. That is what we heard. Now it is pretty generally accepted that England is not going to fall soon any way. They cannot invade England. That has changed the situation in the last 2 weeks.

The war has been transferred to Africa and to Asia. We are beginning to see new duties as an ally of England. Where will that take us? Mr. Chairman, we ought to repeal the Conscription Act, then adopt the George Washington policy that we followed for so long, and until right now. We should take care of ourselves first of all.

It is wonderfully illuminating, is it not, that we find London has not been hurt very badly after all, that they lied to us, that in the press the worst pictures were shown, that they never quit riding horses in the parks or playing golf over there. It is stated now that they feared more the shells from their own antiaircraft guns than they did the German bombs. We did not get it that way at first. Now England is not going to fall. If that be so, we do not need this conscription bill. Then again the volunteers are coming along fine. Voluntary enlistments are holding up great. We do not need conscription.

Mr. Chairman, the ranking Republican member of the Military Affairs Committee made a rather interesting statement in the last minute or two before the vote on the conscription bill 2 weeks ago next Saturday. The argument arose as to who the author was, whether it was the distinguished gentleman in front of me from New York or a gentleman over in the Senate. The question came up as to who the author of the conscription bill was. He finally admitted it was the Army; that they had been trying for 8 years to get us to adopt this system, and that the Army had finally won out. We are not able to cross a "t" or dot an "i" in these deficiency bills except on Army authority. The Army is ruling this land right now, and we ought to wake up. We ought to repeal conscription because there are so many bad things that go with it; it is awfully expensive, and we are going to hear a lot of bad things about it before next spring. We do not need it. There is no great national emergency now. My stand has constantly been that this hysteria about national defense is "hokey," and I am ready to stake my political future on that proposition.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Briefly.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Does the gentleman think if there is an emergency it is one that has come to us because we have not kept our collective noses out of matters that have no concern to the people of this country?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Absolutely, and one of the pathetic things of this campaign, and I say this with temerity, is that there is no collision between the leading candidates. One emphasizes the international policy and the other emphasizes the failure of domestic policies. It does not seem that we are going to have collision in this campaign on any proposition. We have no one representing George Washington and the things he stood for in his Farewell Address in this great campaign and in this so-called national emergency.

This hysteria was started by the President of the United States in his speech to the House and Senate on the 15th of May, in which he depicted just exactly how many hours it would take Germany to bomb Denver and Kansas City. And they cannot even hurt London across a little creek after 3 months. That created a hysteria, it started all the hysteria, and the whole propaganda has been built upon that. Oh, there are a lot of reasons. Economic principles have failed. The war was going to give us prosperity. That was the last effort to raise us out of this depression. But we are not thinking about the aftermath like we should. What about it? Where are the smart men who lead our Nation and who know what happened after the last World War? The farmers have felt it for 20 years. As a matter of fact, they are not over it yet. There is no effort to help the farmers in this war. On the contrary, we are going to cater to South America and buy a lot of their food products.

Mr. Chairman, I want to refer to two or three other things. You may differ with me on the aforesaid, but there are a couple of things I want to mention, on which I am sure you will not disagree.

First, I want to ask, when is this national emergency going to end? Who is going to determine that? The armistice determined it in the other World War. That was specific, but who is going to determine the end of this national emergency? If Franklin Roosevelt is reelected for a third term, do you think he is going to terminate this national emer-

gency while President? Not on your life. [Applause.] Who is going to determine, then, the end of the national emergency? That is the point.

We have also heard about our strained national credit. We were just about broke. We heard that for 7 or 8 years. Now, I am one of the meanest in the House so far as economy is concerned. I do not think there is anyone here more opposed to unnecessary expenditures. I have voted against more appropriations, perhaps, than most anybody else. We come along here and appropriate ten or fifteen billion dollars, and we will be talking about appropriating another \$10,000,000,000 next winter, yet no one mentions the national credit, if it is for war, war material, and warmongers. If it is for war and warmongers, the national credit is not even thought of; it is not hinted at.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Does not the gentleman recall that it is only about 6 weeks ago, after the Republicans of the House had voted to stay here and were criticized by His Eminence in the White House for it, that we were asked for all these appropriations? None of these emergency appropriations were asked for prior to that time. Was there not an emergency then as much of an emergency as there is today?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. There should have been in the minds of those who are so much smarter than most of us. They should have seen it then.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Is it the gentleman's opinion that the gentleman in the White House had in mind any such program of preparedness as he has presented to the country on a 15-minute schedule?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I think he has taken us a long distance past what public sentiment really wants, and he is taking us into this war by the back door. As sure as the sun rises, if he is reelected we will be sending men to England, Africa, or wherever he thinks we can best help the Queen of England to carry out the great purposes of the British Empire, involving us around the world. There will not be any question about it. As the gentleman from California said, there is not any politics in this and there should not be, but I say that the minute this election is over, if the President is crowned king for the third time, we will have a different national policy that will be as bold as Hitler's, and that he will take his election as a vindication that he can do anything he wants to with our Army. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL].

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, when I went to high school the teacher used to read from English authors or American literature a short sketch and then ask the pupils to name the author. I have listened to a speech, and if I had not been present and known who made it, if it had been submitted to me on the street, I would have said it was made by either Earl Browder or Fritz Kuhn. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the question of whether or not we are in an emergency I believe is water over the dam as far as congressional action is concerned. We have passed legislation under which men are being ordered to camp. It is our responsibility now to provide the funds for their pay, subsistence, housing, hospitalization, equipment, and general welfare.

I have considerable sympathy for those who argue that the so-called emergency has been created. Certainly little has been done by this country to avert one. How much encouragement has been given by representatives of this country to foreign nations to get into this war, the public does not know and may not know for years. I wish we did know.



"Personally I have resisted many of the so-called steps short of war, because I have believed they were steps toward war. Certainly they have been steps in that direction; they have not been steps away from war and steps short of war have taken us in that direction faster and further than people generally have realized. So, I accept no responsibility for the emergency, but however we got here—here we are, and I join those who believe that it is better to have insurance and protection and not need it than to need it and not have it.

I am not going to go back home and boast of the fact that I have been here and voted for practically all of these appropriation bills to provide matériel and equipment. I am not going to be particularly proud of that fact because I do not regard it as taking any intelligence or superpatriotism to sit here and say, "Yes, yes, yes," as these requests come along, and vote for them. The thing I wish I could boast about when I go back home is that this Congress had taken more constructive steps toward preventing the emergency which has arisen than the steps we are taking helter-skelter to try to meet it.

The discussion that has come on this bill ought to make clear to the country, although it possibly will not be clear to the country unless we emphasize it, that this Congress does have within its power the authority to control the operation of the Selective Service Act. This bill is for the purpose, primarily, of providing the funds for the operation of that act. The act provides that it shall be operative only insofar as funds are appropriated, and the minute the Congress refuses to appropriate funds for carrying it out, then that minute the act will no longer be operative, at least beyond the funds that have been previously appropriated.

In connection with the discussion of the costs of preparedness, a table that was put into the hearings of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the War Department last spring on the additions to the original defense bill will be of interest. The gentleman from Michigan asked about the comparative costs and the comparative economics in our preparation and that of other countries. During our hearings I asked General Marshall and General Moore for a statement on that subject. They gave us some figures, which are found on page 32 of the hearings by our subcommittee on the Senate amendments to the Military Establishment appropriation bill for 1941. Some of those figures, I believe, are worthy of bringing to your attention at this time.

In this table, based on 1937 figures, we find that the rate of pay for the private soldier in Great Britain was \$23.55 per month. In France the rate of pay for the conscript private soldier was \$1.05 per month. In Italy the conscript private soldier got a pay of 65 cents per month. In Germany the pay was \$6 per month, in Russia the average was \$11.77 per month, and in Japan \$4.65 per month. At the time this table was prepared our base pay was \$21 per month, and under the Selective Service Act, as you know, it is \$21 per month for the first 4 months, but then becomes \$30 per month.

In estimating the cost of preparedness in this country it is interesting to note the average cost of labor in the several countries in that fiscal year of 1937. The bricklayer in London received 41 cents per hour. In France the bricklayer received \$1.33 per day. In Italy skilled labor received \$1.60 per day and unskilled 85 cents per day. The bricklayer in Rome received 17 cents per hour. In Germany the bricklayer received 43 cents per hour. In Russia the average wage in the building trades was 36 cents per hour. In Japan the bricklayer received \$1.33 per day, or 14 cents per hour.

In the United States a bricklayer in New York received \$1.50 per hour. When that is contrasted, \$1.50 per hour for a bricklayer in New York with 43 cents per hour in Germany, some realization can be had of the comparative cost of defense in the several countries.

General Moore, in specific answer to a question I had asked him, said:

The Assistant Secretary's office testified before the House Military Affairs Committee that an analysis had been made of what had been done in Germany in the last 7 years in the way of preparation, and an analysis was made of what it would cost this country

to do the same relative preparations, as increased by the relatively larger population that we have. The answer is \$100,000,000,000.

Then the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] said "\$100,000,000,000?" And General Moore said, "Yes, sir."

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, we have concrete evidence that there was plenty of information to that effect as far back as 1933, when National Socialist Germany began a feverish rearmament program following a long number of years of disarmament, and while we did adopt many of the so-called social New Deal reforms of National Socialist Germany, we did not at that time take cognizance of their rearmament program and we passed that up until May 1940.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes; and the gentleman could find further support for his thought in that regard by recalling that out of the twelve-billion-and-odd dollars which we will have appropriated for national defense when this bill is passed in this session of Congress, \$8,104,109,000 of that amount represents Budget estimates that have come to us since the first of the year. In other words, two-thirds of the total appropriations for the Army and the Navy that will have been made in the appropriation bills by this session of Congress, have come to us in Budget estimates since the year began.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Following the question of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] was there anything to indicate that Germany at that time ever contemplated rearming herself to attack the United States, and was there any reason why we at that time should have gone into a state of feverish excitement and commence to prepare for war at sea, air, and on land?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me on that?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman really wants information, I will tell him exactly where to get it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am asking the question of the gentleman who has the floor.

Mr. CRAWFORD. All right.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And I have yielded to the gentleman from Michigan to answer the question which grew out of the question that he raised here.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman will take the book recently published by Reynal and Hitchcock, known as *The German Economy 1870 to 1940*, and the *Voice of Destruction*, published by G. P. Putnam's Sons in 1940, and the *Economy Recovery of Germany from 1933 to the Incorporation of Austria in March 1938*, published by Macmillan & Co., he will get a complete answer to the question, and the gentleman will find that the whole world was served notice that Germany intended to blaze its way across the path of the globe. We had all the information in the world that we needed, and by "we" I mean our official staff in the State Department and the executive department also had it, but they did not for political reasons put it before the American public and they refused to give it to me when I requested the President last fall to give it to me specifically, and he said he did not have time to answer my question.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman answer this question?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Does the gentleman think from the information he has received and that he has just told us about, that Germany then intended to lay the foundation for invading the United States, and does he think now that Germany intends to invade the United States?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Germany laid the foundation for invading the United States economically and that we should be prepared to meet it—

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am not talking about "economically."

Mr. CRAWFORD (continuing). Through the detailed information which Herr Hitler sets forth with reference to his proposed colonizations and economic invasions in Mexico and Latin America, which would constitute a direct attack against the entire Monroe Doctrine and our national defense.

Mr. O'CONNOR. There is not any question but what she intended to compete with us in trade, but I am talking about from a military standpoint.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman will permit, the whole weight of the talk here today is a question of economics which we must eventually face and our whole procedure with reference to the national debt, and we should leave no stone unturned to prepare for our successfully meeting that economic invasion.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Then it is not war you are talking about, but economics that you are talking about. Our defense program is grounded on the theory of military invasion.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is all war is about at any time. We have no record to show Germany could successfully invade the United States of America unless by our will they do so. I do not fear direct military invasion. It may come through Mexico or South America.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course, it is my personal conviction that with the sources of information that should have been available to the administration, the administration was fully capable of having known prior to May 1940 the threat of the German military machine, and on the same point I feel that the countries of Europe had plenty of opportunity to know what they were facing. I do not know whether Hitler originally intended to invade England, but if he ever did, he is giving the matter a second thought at this time.

I do not know that he ever seriously thought of invading the United States. I doubt it. But I am confident that if we had the air force we should have had, he would not think of it. The American people are concerned more with our lack of preparedness in the air than at any other point.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yet when visitors went to Germany and came back and told England and came back and told the United States what Germany was doing in the way of air preparedness, those people were criticized and crucified. Witness Lindbergh and his warnings 2 and 3 years ago.

Now, there are some other items I would like to discuss in this bill, but because of the limitation of time I will put them off until we come to consideration under the 5-minute rule.

In closing, I want to repeat that I am not going to boast about voting for these appropriation bills for national defense, because it seems to me that Congress and the administration had a far greater responsibility, and that was of trying to solve the problem of how the nations of the world will live together. If we devoted one-tenth of the money to that kind of a proposition that we are devoting to military preparedness, we would come far nearer solving the real problem confronting the world at this time.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, the men of our generation, the leaders of the world in our day, are falling down on the great job of our times. I cannot think of the boys who went overseas in 1917 and 1918 in a war to end war and who did not come back and in my mind say to them "We are being fair to you" when 20 years later we are getting right back to the same proposition of a world-wide war. I cannot look at that picture of that little girl on Life magazine that came out the other day and see the bewildered terror in her innocent eyes and feel that we are doing our job if we simply sit here and say "yes" when requests for military appropriations come along. We have a much greater responsibility, and

LXXXVI—798

that is to try to find some way for the nations of the world to live together in peace. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I fear I have little contribution to make toward answering the great questions before us, except making an observation or two, I was struck by the solemn tone of the chairman of the subcommittee today as he pointed out that we are not taking thought of the future sufficiently; that we ought to be thinking of what will happen tomorrow. He is a wise man, yet admits that he sees dimly but fearfully the momentous problems ahead.

Following also the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] this came to my thought: There are some things too great for even the mind of man to grasp. Out in my State we have a majestic feature of nature which the human mind can scarcely comprehend, and the brush of the artist cannot portray. The greatest artists in the world attempt to paint natural beauty, but none attempt the grandeur of the Grand Canyon of the Colorado River in northern Arizona. They are forced to admit that they are incapable, with all of their art and skill, to do justice to that awe-inspiring sublimity.

I recall at the opening of the World War that the literary world waited in vain for some master of the English language, some Kipling to come along and write a far greater Recessional. But none appeared. How did it happen that Kipling himself, yet alive at that time, was not able to surpass his earlier production? Certainly in 1914 and 1918 greater things were expected of a Kipling than those which inspired the Recessional in the first place. Was it not the immensity of it all that stunned the human mind? The times may be so awful as to deaden rather than inspire. Apparently it was so a quarter century ago.

How is it today? The same—or worse. The thing which has recently happened in the world is so cataclysmic that the mind of most of us cannot comprehend it. Heretofore we have sometimes tried to indicate the significance of an historic event by saying it marked the end of one age and the beginning of another. But this present world war may mark the end of one civilization and the beginning of another totally different.

In all our efforts at preparedness, let us fortify our minds and souls as well as our shores. Military preparedness is now the first essential. Along with that let us strengthen the American way of life against any and all eventualities. Let us take thought—if it is within human power—to cushion our Nation against the inevitable shocks ahead—economic shocks and those other shocks which are likely to come to the thought life and to the spiritual life of our people out of this time of trouble.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. This bill carries an appropriation for \$1,311,493,636 to take care of the expense of the draft and the drafted men for the present fiscal year ending June 30, 1941. I spoke and voted against the draft. I felt that it was unnecessary to conscript the manpower of this Nation in peacetime. This Nation has never done so before. Press reports indicated yesterday that perhaps none of the men would be drafted—we could and would get more volunteers than are necessary to meet the requirements of the Army, Navy, and Air Corps. I pointed out in my speech against the draft bill that thousands of volunteers were on the waiting list to get into the Navy and Air Corps and about 800,000 men were subject to the call of the President for the Army, a much larger number than we can take care of at this time, and furthermore, that able-bodied young men were volunteering at the rate of more than 40,000 a month.

But the administration forced through this conscription bill and we must now appropriate money to take care of the expense and take care of the men who may be drafted; and I



rise, not in opposition to this appropriation but to make some observations along the same line of those made today by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum].

I have said many times that the great threat to our Nation is because of conditions in our own country and not from any attack that may be made from foreign countries. This administration has been and is now neglecting the important domestic problems. Counting the sums set out in this bill, Congress will have appropriated and authorized for contracts more than \$12,000,000,000 for national defense for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1940, and ending June 30, 1941. That is a tremendous sum of money, but it is only about half of the sum this Congress has appropriated since it met on January 3, 1940. Congress has appropriated and authorized the expenditure of approximately \$23,000,000,000 this fiscal year. What a staggering sum! This is more than 60 percent of the actual sum of money spent during the World War when we had 5,000,000 men under arms, and 5 times as much as it cost to run the Government and win the 4 years of the Civil War. This will be three times as much as the revenues collected by the Government for the present fiscal year.

Our direct and indirect debts and obligations today amount to more than \$50,000,000,000, and before this fiscal year closes, our direct and indirect debts and obligations will be more than \$60,000,000,000. Does that tremendous sum mean anything to the safety of our country and our national defense?

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am very sorry indeed that I cannot yield at this time to my distinguished and able friend from Vermont. My time is very limited.

A sound public credit is of the greatest importance to the defense and safety of any nation. What does this administration propose to do toward stopping this continued pyramiding of our national debt and further weakening of our national credit? This is the eleventh consecutive year of deficits. We shall have the largest deficit this year of any year. No one in the administration suggests that they plan to stop these deficits or halt the mounting national debt. President Roosevelt and his New Deal Congress will not stop the deficits, the increase of the national debt, or the increase of taxes. They cannot and will not solve this problem. They entered upon a career of taxing and squandering, borrowing and spending. The American people will have to elect an anti New Deal Congress and an anti New Deal administration in order to correct this condition and to protect the country.

#### THE FOLLY OF THE NEW DEAL'S GOLD POLICY

President Roosevelt forced through a subservient Congress a bill giving him the power to regulate our money and fix the value thereof, when, as a matter of fact, the Constitution gave this power to the Congress alone. Under this measure the President hiked the price of gold from less than \$21 an ounce to \$35 an ounce, and announced to the world that the United States would pay \$35 an ounce for all the gold that might be offered to us. This caused the expansion of gold mines and developed new gold mines throughout the world, and under that policy we have bought \$14,000,000,000 worth of gold, which, added to our supply of \$7,000,000,000, gives us now \$21,000,000,000 of gold. Eighty-five percent of this gold comes from foreign countries. This \$14 bonus on each ounce causes a continued flow of gold from all parts of the world—Russia, Mexico, Central and South America, India, Australia, Canada, and other countries.

We now have 80 percent of the movable gold of the world. The balance of trade between nations is supposed to be settled with gold. We are the greatest surplus-producing country of the world. We have a surplus of farm and industrial commodities and the gold. Nations needing our commodities cannot buy them because we have already bought up their gold. This gold continues to pour in, and we bury it down in Kentucky. It is a bonanza for the foreign gold producers. Strange to say, you hear no plan or suggestion from the administration about stopping this tremendous folly. Can we continue throughout the years to take in all the gold of the world at \$14 an ounce more than its value? It must stop sometime. We cannot go on forever this way

adding to our national debt and stripping the commerce of the world of its medium of exchange. This administration will not stop this folly because when it is announced to the world that the United States will no longer take all the gold and pay \$35 an ounce, the price of gold will go back to its real market value, and that will mean a loss of billions of dollars to our Government. The administration is unwilling to face the exposure.

The Under Secretary of State, Mr. Berle, has, however, made the suggestion that when the war is over that in order to have business with Europe it will be necessary for us to make a present of one-half of our gold to Europe. This is one of the greatest follies of all of the follies of the New Deal. It can only be stopped by electing a Republican Congress and a Republican administration.

#### AGRICULTURE HEADED FOR DISASTER

The New Deal pushed through its plan for agriculture. It loans to the cotton, wheat, and corn growers a greater sum than the market price of these commodities, and gives the growers the option to turn over these commodities and cancel the debt. The result is that the Government has acquired a tremendous surplus of cotton, corn, and wheat. Today the United States Government owns or controls 10,000,000 bales of cotton, 500,000,000 bushels of corn, and 100,000,000 bushels of wheat piled up in cribs. At the end of this crop season the Government will own and have under its control more than 14,000,000 bales of cotton, and will have additional hundreds of millions of bushels of wheat and corn sealed up in cribs. This cotton, corn, and wheat surplus has been growing and will continue to grow.

Before this administration put on its cotton program we exported more than 8,000,000 bales of cotton annually. Last year and before the war this had dropped to a little over 2,000,000 bales, and this year it will be less than 2,000,000 bales, and our exports of corn and wheat have been greatly reduced. It would take about 2 years without a stalk of cotton being grown to take up the surplus of cotton that will be owned and controlled by the Government at the end of this crop year. These surpluses like our gold supply are piling up day by day. At the end of this crop year the Government will have invested in cotton approximately a billion dollars, and one-half billion dollars in wheat and corn. This administration cannot and will not solve this problem. It must be solved some day and somehow. The Government cannot continue to borrow money and go on forever increasing the surplus of cotton, wheat, and corn. Like the gold policy they will persist in going on until we go over the precipice.

This administration has adopted a policy of scarcity instead of plenty. Some plan should be worked out similar to the McNary-Haugen plan which would fully protect the American farmer in a depressed world market and the Government dispose of the surplus every year and not allow it to accumulate as this administration has done and will continue to do.

Of course, under the farm policy of the present administration if this cotton, wheat, and corn should be put on the market it would break the market. The New Deal with this policy has run up against a dead end. Like the gold accumulation folly the New Deal is committed to its folly and it will require a Republican Congress and a Republican administration to correct this condition.

Our farm policy here has encouraged a greatly increased production of cotton and other farm commodities in foreign countries. They are now supplying the markets that the American farmers formerly supplied. Unfortunately, we have lost these markets to the American farmers forever. As our farmers have been forced to cut down their production it has increased production in foreign countries. As we have cut out acreage it has taken away the jobs of a million farming families in this country and has reduced the purchasing power which reflects itself in the loss of jobs to the workers in our factories, mills, shops, and mines. Great quantities of farm products and manufactured goods have come in under the reciprocal-trade agreements.

One of the commissions of this administration recently reported that there were 45,000,000 Americans undernour-

ished—yes; and I might say underhoused and underclothed, needing food, shelter, and raiment; yet 10,000,000 bales of cotton are piled up in warehouses, 500,000,000 bushels of corn and 100,000,000 bushels of wheat are sealed up in cribs and elevators. But this administration will continue to pile up surpluses, and our people will continue to be unemployed, undernourished, poorly housed, and poorly clad. We must have a Congress and an administration that believes in the philosophy of plenty and not of scarcity. No people were ever happy, contented, or prosperous under a policy of scarcity. These blessings always come with plenty. [Applause.]

#### THE UNEMPLOYMENT MENACE

There are more unemployed today than when Mr. Roosevelt was a candidate for President in 1932 and pledged himself and his party to solve the unemployment problem. His great friend, John L. Lewis, has said in a number of public addresses that the New Deal administration has not solved the unemployment problem or any of the great problems that confronted Mr. Roosevelt when he took office March 4, 1933. Mr. Lewis further asserted that this administration had accomplished little or nothing except to increase taxes, create deficits and more deficits, and to pile up a huge national debt, and that the administration has offered no constructive solution for any of these great problems or held out any promise or hope of relief from the conditions that now confront the people of this country. The council of the A. F. of L. made a similar indictment.

We cannot hope to go forward until we have solved in a just and sensible way the problems of the farmers; put the shops, mills, factories, mines, and other private enterprises to work, and provide jobs for these millions of unemployed. The billions now being poured out for war have furnished temporary prosperity and temporary jobs to certain industries and workers, but we must not forget these are produced by borrowed money, by increasing the deficits, and by increasing our national debt. We are merely reaching out, eating up and consuming the future of ourselves and of our boys and girls.

#### WHAT WILL HAPPEN AFTER THE WAR?

I have never believed that Hitler would attempt the foolish and impossible task of invading the United States or the Western Hemisphere. I do not now believe he will make any such attempt. The real danger to our country is not a naval or military invasion of the United States or Latin America. Germany and other nations now engaged in war may attempt an economic invasion after the war.

Germany, Italy, England, France, Japan, and every other great country of the world will be bankrupt when this war is over. Our Nation has the gold. They will have nothing with which to buy our products. They will set about to produce manufactured and farm products in great quantities. Their people will work long hours and receive sweatshop wages. They will use child labor, and their working conditions will be bad. Then they will attempt to dump their cheaply produced products into the United States and South America. They will attempt an economic invasion.

It will be a tremendous shock to our standard of living. We will then need our money and credit to tide us over that period. We will then wake up to find that we have squandered and wasted our money and our credit and greatly weakened ourselves to meet this great economic struggle. We have been showering Central and South America with loans and other favors to build up our export trade there. Let me point out, however, that South Americans, when the war is over, will buy where they can buy the cheapest. When that war is over it will require a Republican Congress and a Republican administration to protect American farmers, American industrial workers, and American business from that economic foreign invasion.

#### BUT MR. ROOSEVELT HAS SUCCEEDED

Mr. Roosevelt has succeeded in creating more bureaus and commissions; he has succeeded in increasing the number of Federal officeholders from a little over 500,000 to more than 1,000,000; he has succeeded in increasing the number of people needing some form of public relief; he has succeeded in

increasing the amount of revenues collected from the people annually more than 250 percent; he has succeeded in increasing the national debts and national obligations from approximately \$20,000,000,000 to more than fifty billions, and with the commitments he has made it will be more than sixty billions. He has succeeded in increasing the amount of deficits from approximately \$4,000,000,000 when he went into office to thirty billions, and when the commitments he has made have been met these deficits will amount to forty billions. He has succeeded in greatly increasing the enmity of the people of the world against the United States; he has succeeded in surpassing all other American Presidents in meddling in the affairs of other countries. He has succeeded in stirring up class hatred; he has succeeded in hindering private enterprise; he has succeeded in substituting doles for jobs; he has succeeded in greatly curtailing the liberties and freedom of the American people; and he has succeeded in gathering to himself more dictatorial powers than all the other Presidents put together.

I am alarmed to think what the results will be to our Nation if our politically ambitious President is given a third term. To preserve the liberties of the American people the third term should be denied to him, and to correct these conditions and to solve these problems there must be a change. Without a change do we not face disaster?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Kentucky yield me 13 minutes' additional time?

Mr. O'NEAL. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, considerable has been said today regarding the knowledge European countries and the United States had as to just what Germany was doing in the interim between 1933, when Hitler came into power, and the time we began to build our defense program.

I call attention to the RECORD of June 21, 1939, at which time I spoke on the floor of the House calling attention to certain facts. Colonel Lindbergh had testified before our committee some 2 hours. Only one and a half pages of that testimony was published in the printed hearings; the remainder was not published.

Colonel Lindbergh testified that he went through German factories in 1937 and 1938. His testimony was so amazing that I turned to him and asked him just what factories he went through. Colonel Lindbergh named factory after factory. I asked, "Did they not try to stop you?" He said, "No." Now, mark well this: I asked, "Did anyone go with you?" He answered, "Yes."

"Who went with you?"

His reply, to my amazement and surprise, was: "A military attaché from the American Embassy in Berlin."

If you will look at the RECORD of June 21, 1939, you will recall that I made the statement on the floor of this House that military attachés were not on the job.

I said at that time that apparently the first qualification of a military attaché to a foreign office was that he must have a wealthy wife to finance his social obligations; that apparently from the results obtained it does not make any difference whether he is a nincompoop or not, just so he can meet his social obligations in a financial way.

I asked Lindbergh at that time whether anyone else went with him. He replied, "Yes; an aviation expert from the French Army went with us on one occasion." Despite this statement the figures furnished us by the Army as to the number of airplanes each country had, including Germany and Italy, were absolutely wrong. It was upon these erroneous figures that we based our program.

We have failed miserably in research and development. We were told by General Arnold and Colonel Lindbergh a year ago last January that we were from 3 to 5 years behind



Germany. I quote a question from page 7648 of the RECORD of June 21, 1929, as taken from committee hearings:

If we were so far behind England, Germany, and France in airplane construction, why was it that France came over here to buy some of our military planes?

General Arnold replied that in the emergency France was in, they were ready to buy anything. This testimony was given off the record and never contradicted.

I have information that these planes sold to France took part in the battle of Flanders. The whole French air force was wiped out during the first 10 days. The German planes had self-sealing, leak-proof gasoline tanks. The American and French planes did not have that improvement. The German planes had armored pilot seats. The French and American planes were not so armored. Can you imagine what would happen if an armored bandit car went down the streets of Washington with machine guns firing through the sides and the police department were trying to capture it with an open touring car? If you can, you may realize what happened when these planes went into action.

Mr. Chairman, it is suicide for one of these planes to contact a plane equipped with armored pilot seats and self-sealing tanks.

You will recall the story in the press when the first of these German planes was finally brought down; they discovered hundreds of bullet holes through the gasoline tanks, with several hundred gallons of gasoline remaining in the tanks.

Mr. Chairman, the Army had the authority on January 30, 1939, to build 907 planes. They had had that authority from 17 to 19 months. The reason they did not build those planes was because they were waiting for development of various appliances to place in those planes. Then suddenly in January the President decided he wanted planes. They wanted planes and more planes. Up to then they wanted quality first, then quantity. Now they wanted planes. It did not make any difference what kind of planes—just planes. General Arnold testified as follows:

What we wanted heretofore was quality. Now we want quantity.

Mr. Chairman, in that speech on June 21, 1939, on the floor of this House I opposed the building of 2,200 planes of that type and the placing of them in the reserve of the Army. I took the position that they would be obsolete before they were built. We know today that they are obsolete. Only a few of them were built, and most of those that were built were released to France and wiped out in Flanders and elsewhere; thank God they did not have American boys at the stick.

On June 21, 1939, I spoke on the floor of this House as follows:

Mr. Chairman, this is a frank confession that we are building obsolete planes because we want quantity now instead of quality. Colonel Lindbergh said we should have quality first, then quantity. I maintain that this is absolutely outrageous, to build planes which they frankly confess are obsolete, as the testimony shows that even with our greatest development we are from 3 to 5 years behind European countries. How far behind will we be with these planes in 1941 when completed?

Now, I want to discuss the problem of plane construction, and I want to give you an illustration I gave some time ago on the floor of this House as to what one of our problems is. Two years ago I heard General Craig talk to a pilot in a plane 33,000 feet in the air. Thirty-three thousand feet, if straight up, would be 6 miles. Sound travels at the rate of 1 mile in 5 seconds. A plane that travels 300 miles an hour is obsolete, yet that plane will travel a mile in 12 seconds. A plane traveling 450 miles an hour is traveling at the rate of a mile in 8 seconds. We are today approaching in the speed of planes the speed of sound, 8 seconds a mile for a plane, 5 seconds for sound. It required sound 30 seconds to come down from that plane 33,000 feet in the sky to our sounding apparatus on the ground. During that 30 seconds the plane, if traveling at 300 miles an hour, would have traveled  $2\frac{1}{2}$  miles, and if traveling at the rate of 450 miles an hour would have traveled 4 miles. All we would know down here is that 30 seconds before up there 6 miles in the air was a plane, but during that 30 seconds it had gone  $2\frac{1}{2}$

to 4 miles God knows in which direction. That is what we have confronting us. The Army has actually solved this problem.

When I heard that broadcast I made the statement that we required antiaircraft guns that could reach 30,000 feet in the air, because we would have to use them at that range in the near future. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, Kansas ranks fifth in the States of the Union in the production of oil. Our State could greatly increase its production to the advantage of operators, farmers, and laborers, except for the fact that we conform to the proration agreement of the midcontinent field. Some wells in Kansas are given an allowable production of less than 1 percent of potential. The oil producers are cooperating in every way to keep the industry on a stable basis. It is discouraging, therefore, to note the rapid increase in oil imports.

Imports of low-cost foreign petroleum which make no contribution to American labor or American public revenues take a greater portion of the market for domestic petroleum products than the entire State of Kansas is permitted to supply. Kansas has been holding down its production while a few big companies who are the chief importers of foreign petroleum have been increasing their importations, displacing domestic oil in our own home markets.

Some idea of the importance of these imports may be gained by comparing the daily average production of crude oil in the State of Kansas with the imports which enter our domestic markets. The following figures make this comparison for the first 7 months of 1940:

	Daily average imports	Daily average Kansas production
	Barrels	Barrels
January.....	142,000	171,000
February.....	211,000	176,000
March.....	228,000	180,000
April.....	217,000	161,000
May.....	197,000	168,000
June.....	194,000	178,000
July.....	206,000	188,000

NOTE.—The above figures on imports are taken from data supplied by the U. S. Tariff Commission. Figures on Kansas production are taken from the U. S. Bureau of Mines report.

The self-restraint which Kansas places upon itself is illustrated by the fact that while the daily average production in Kansas during July was 188,000 barrels, the potential production on June 1 was 5,384,182 barrels, according to the Oil and Gas Journal, a recognized authority in the petroleum industry.

From these figures it will be seen that imports were larger than Kansas' production in every month of this year except January. We have another Kansas, in effect, but an uncontrolled and unregulated Kansas. It is a Kansas whose benefits flow not to thousands of citizens of this country but to a few large and powerful importing oil companies. It is a Kansas that does not have to make any contribution to the national conservation program. It is a Kansas without the high labor standards and fair wages enjoyed by the workers in this country. It is a Kansas that makes no contribution to the national defense, but rather, because of the reduced import taxes under the Venezuelan trade agreement, is actually permitted to enjoy an additional competitive advantage it did not have in former years. Certainly the domestic producers have a right to fear these imports, which show an increase of 30 percent for the first 6 months of 1940 over the same period in 1939.

The reciprocal-trade agreement with Venezuela became effective December 16, 1939. This agreement reduced by 50 percent the excise taxes on petroleum and its products imported for consumption within this country. The total quota established for all imports at the reduced rate is no measure of the total quantity of oil that can be imported.

For the first half of this year taxable imports from Venezuela increased 32 percent; from the Netherland West Indies, 127 percent; and from Old Mexico, 3,770 percent. Mexico's importation rose from a daily average of less than 800 barrels to an average of 30,000 barrels per day. Imports of petroleum and its products during the first half of 1940 totaled 38,449,347 barrels. This large increase must be made at the expense of the producers in this country as the imports increased 75 percent while there was only a 5-percent increase in the total petroleum consumption in the United States.

These imports of low-cost foreign oil are not a new problem for the domestic producers, but they are a particularly troublesome one this year. Several factors contribute to this. First, these imports have increased greatly, as shown by the fact that imports subject to excise taxes for consumption within the United States increased 76 percent in the first 7 months of this year as compared with the same period of 1939. At the same time the war has resulted in a loss of 26 percent in our export markets. The domestic producer is being squeezed between falling export markets and rising import supplies. There is not very much that the people of this country can do about our foreign markets, but they can and must do something about these imports which are threatening the life of the small producer in the State of Kansas and in all other oil-producing States.

Trade agreements reducing the excise tax on oil should be rescinded. In fact, the country would benefit from an increase in the excise tax on oil instead of having it further reduced. [Applause.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I hope that every Member of this House will at some time or other read the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] which were made in the course of his explanatory statement on the pending bill. He raised a very interesting question, and it is particularly interesting because today marks the second anniversary of Munich. Who could have envisioned when the stone was thrown across the world waters at Munich how far the repercussions would go, how they would embrace ultimately Norway, Poland, and Czechoslovakia, and provoke a tremendous defense program in this country? But there will be an end to the repercussions from Munich. There will come a time when the war will be over. It is reminiscent of that rather lyrical ditty of the gay nineties, as they say, "After the ball is over, after the break of day." In that vein one might suggest that after the war is over, after the firing has ceased, there will come a great many problems for this country, and the time to take thought of those problems is now, in my judgment.

There are many factors involved, of course. One of them is the enormous debt of preparation that we are piling up day after day and with each recurring appropriation bill. We give a great deal of thought, of course, to the end of the war in terms of the international situation and the possibility of an intensive world competition under which we must engage in barter in order to meet the efficacy of other countries, and the possible repercussion of that barter system upon the standard of living in this country, the curtailment of our own opportunities, and the prospect of even greater control for industry and agriculture.

The former Secretary of Agriculture, now a candidate for the Vice Presidency, has been emphasizing that very fact in the Middle West as he goes on his campaign tour. I allude to it briefly, and obviously 6 minutes is not enough in which to do it justice. One ought to have a couple of hours to discuss that matter. However, I think at least it serves the virtue of pitching and poisoning the question in your minds.

We think of war in terms of the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse. If you read the Apocalypse very closely you will find a fifth horseman. He is there, and he is the Horseman of Despair. He comes afterward. Of course, that de-

spair will be dished up for this country. Here we have an economy now that is directed upon what we might call an artificial boom in armament, but do not forget there is only one purchaser in that kind of economy; that is, the Government of the United States or other governments. There is only one kind of merchandise, and that is the merchandise of death. But when the end comes, then there comes dislocation, the demobilization of those in uniform and, as they seek to retrieve their jobs, there comes the lengthening of those tenuous unemployment lines which are still long today. There comes the diminution of our national wealth, and also the collapse of national income. But do you not know that when the final score is written, the debt service will be \$1,500,000,000 a year, but that income will have diminished, and so you have an annual standing interest charge with a diminished capacity to take care of that load. And then what? Then comes collapse.

It is high time that we stop thinking exclusively in terms of what the international-trade situation will be after the war is over. Domestic problems also demand attention. We have not solved the problem of stagnant capital. It is all right for these dollars to find their way into the armament industries and expand the figures, but when the war is over that will collapse. That will have to be curtailed. Then what about the American economy? It behooves us now to be thinking about it in the hope that by a judicious approach now we can meet that day when the fifth horseman of despair starts riding over all the earth, because that will be a great problem and a great responsibility.

Frankly, I may say to my good friend from Virginia, I am not at all sure about the answer, but I think there is a factor in the answer that we can see now, and that is that you cannot hobble industry too closely, you cannot press too many restrictions on it and then go out and demand the utmost of a crippled industry. The very fact that the conferees are wrestling with a tax bill today that has a very difficult amortization provision in it is the best testimony I know of. People often throw rocks and point an accusing finger at the industry of America and say they are engaged in a sit-down strike, so we must needs by some device in a conscription bill seek to conscript those industrial services.

I do not believe that that is the answer. I believe that when we ask industry to submit themselves to a single purchaser in the form of the Government to manufacture the goods of death we ought to play fair also and make it possible to amortize those plant facilities over a short space of time. They will be utterly valueless when finally the four horsemen—of war, pestilence, death, and famine—cease to ride. So the evidence is very much here. While I think it is a grand thing to hold onto the gains that have been made, yet there must be a relenting of certain restrictions if you are going to pitch this grave problem and this grave responsibility upon American industry and say, "You solve it." You must give them the legislative instruments and help to do it.

As we go along that is one factor that will show up continuously in the answer, and in proportion as we show a little more leniency in dealing with industry and what we demand of it, we can make preparation for what is to come after. I think it is going to have a tendency to head off some of these disastrous effects that will come as a part of a world-wide dislocation.

Casual reflection upon the domestic problems which will become acutely aggravated after the world forsakes its present madness and returns to sanity indicates that these problems will include demobilization of men in uniform, the cessation of the manufacture of war goods and supplies, the diminution of revenues, the shrinkage in national income and a continuing annual interest charge of one and one-half billion dollars which will weigh as a staggering burden upon the weakened economy of our country.

One hesitates to bring forth the unpleasant reminder that, in the period following the World War, Government obligations which sold at \$980 per thousand in the latter part of 1918 had depreciated to \$860 only 18 months later.



The present program in all its aspects manifestly requires the issuance of additional billions of Government paper as annual deficits continue and grow larger. The gross amount of such obligations which must be carried by banks, insurance companies, and other institutions of the country grows year by year. What a ghastly situation could develop if we fail now to exhibit a degree of vision and seek toward those things which will minimize the shock of dislocation when the present madness ends.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, there is an ancient Norse legend of Alaric, the Viking chief, hero of a thousand battles, who, on his deathbed, promised his companions-in-arms that if ever needed he would come back to lead them to victory; and in Denmark there has been told through the centuries the folklore story of a sleeping Danish king who would return to defend Denmark in her hour of need. A shepherd searching among inaccessible crags for a lost herd found himself in a vast cavern where the sleeping monarch clad in armor still sat upon his throne. As he gazed, the King stirred in his sleep and murmured, "Is it time; give me thy hand." Afraid to approach nearer, the peasant reached out the steel point of his alpenstock and the tough metal melted like butter in his grasp as he muttered, "Ah, there are men in Denmark still." Even in modern France, the peasants have always believed that in a national crisis their sainted Joan of Arc would arise to lead them. But the enemy came swift and terrible. The invader, unprovoked and unchallenged, savage and ruthless, ravaged Norway and Denmark without cause or occasion—and Alaric and Holger Danska, and even the dauntless spirit of the Maid of Orleans, slept on.

Here in America we likewise have had our legends. "It could not happen here." "The memory of Washington and Lincoln and of every hero from Bunker Hill to Chateau-Thierry would give us spiritual power." "A million men would spring to arms."

But what arms? We cannot fight today with the armament of 1776, or even with the weapons of 1914—as nations have learned to their cost. When Paul Revere rode through Middlesex arousing the minutemen, all that was necessary was for them to rise, pull on their boots, reach above the door for their rifles, and pick a convenient place behind a stone wall along the invader's line of march. That strategy was effective in colonial New England, but it would not protect New York or San Francisco today. Neither the rifle nor the untrained minuteman or even the stone wall would be of avail in modern warfare.

The French on the Maginot line complained that when the Germans came across they saw no men; they saw only tanks and machinery and flaming guns.

France had the men but lacked the machinery, and there was no time to provide it. And almost overnight a great world power, a nation that had dominated Europe, a culture and a civilization that had enriched every period of history, vanished like a falling star, and in darkened London men cower in subterranean shelter to escape the death that flies by night.

In this lawless age when continents are being robbed and enslaved without provocation or excuse, no nation can hope to survive that is not able to defend itself. And self-defense is merely a matter of modern armament and men trained to use it. We have already provided the money for armament. In this bill, the last link in the preparedness program, we provide money for men. One is useless without the other. With the passage of this bill we have now provided for both. With the passage of this legislation it is merely a matter of time before we will have planes, tanks, guns, and ships, and, most important of all, men trained to use them.

And it cannot be emphasized too strongly that this vast expenditure is not a step toward war. It is a step away from war. It is insurance against war. It is the shotgun behind the door, the knowledge of which will deter predatory mar-

auders who otherwise might be tempted by our well-filled corncribs and our crowded chicken roosts.

I listened with interest to the gentleman who preceded me. He is one of the valuable members of the House and I hear him always with pleasure and profit. But I regretted that he devoted the time to a discussion of conditions which will follow the close of the war emergency, when we shall again beat our swords into plowshares and our spears into pruning hooks. Sadly enough that millennium is in the far distant future. Of course it is an intriguing speculation and I suppose I have hammered all the changes on that question harder than any man on this floor. From the beginning of this session I have repeatedly called attention to the fact that eventually the war must end and have insisted that we take into consideration economic conditions which must inevitably follow the war, especially with relation to agriculture. The certainty of this becomes every day more apparent. The huge flying fortresses, the stupendous 16-inch guns, and all the Gargantuan paraphernalia of war which we are so feverishly building at such astronomical costs will be junk when peace is declared. All combined will not be worth a dime except as scrap metal. And it is natural that we should permit our minds to stray even in these crowded hours to such eventualities.

During the hearings on this bill, I asked General Marshall what might be expected in 1944 when we have completed the program; when we have spent these billions of dollars. And of course he could not answer. Because, for the present, such discussion is purely academic. It is wholly irrelevant. We can cross the bridge of post-war economy when we come to it, but for the present there are but two objectives before us. And to those we should devote all time and interest and energy. One is to prepare as quickly and efficiently as possible to defend this Nation and this continent. That we are doing with every possible dispatch.

The other is to prepare with all circumspection to render an account of our stewardship in the disbursement of the vast sums we are voting to appropriate in this bill and have previously voted to appropriate for the preparedness program in this session. Necessarily, these appropriations are liberal. I have no doubt they are in some instances perhaps too liberal. For under present conditions we could not afford to take any chance. I am frank to say that the subcommittee that held these hearings and reported this bill, accepted every recommendation made by the Army and the Navy. At no time did we cut down any estimate by a penny. We provided every dollar requested, and then not content with that, we asked, "Now, do you need anything more," and they have assured us that we have provided every possible dollar that can be used to expedite the arming of the Nation at top speed.

But it would be unreasonable to suppose that in the disbursement of these vast sums in practically every industry throughout the Nation there would not be some mistakes, that there will not be inevitably some waste. It is to this contingency, if not certainty, we should be devoting our earnest attention and consideration. The day is coming when we must face this phase of the situation and we should have it in mind, and every disbursing agency of the Government should have it in mind, as we go along. This House will appoint some day in the future, and I trust it will be in the near future, an investigating committee with vast powers of inquiry.

They will start here with these appropriations and trace every dollar from the Treasury to its ultimate disposition. They will ask, "How did you spend it? Was it spent honestly? Did you get value received?"

And we must be prepared to show that we neglected no precaution; that we took every possible measure to insure the effective and honest expenditure of this money; and especially that we got results. And we call upon every administrator and every contractor down the line to remember that "they likewise shall give account in the day of judgment."

Mr. ROUTZOHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROUTZOHN. I am in hearty accord with what the gentleman has just said about having a committee appointed for the purpose of watching the expenditure of this money. I would like to know whether or not the gentleman will initiate such a program?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman need have no concern about who will initiate it. There are many on this floor and elsewhere who will attend to that. At the close of the last war a committee spent \$1,000,000 investigating the conduct of the war. Inevitably there will be investigations of this war. I hope it will be done more cheaply, but it will be done as exhaustively.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my colleague on the committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does not the gentleman believe that that investigation should be concurrent with these expenditures and ought to be done long before the war, or the alleged war, is over, if war ever comes to this country, so that while all the evidence is fresh we can go on and make the investigation and find out whether this money has been effectively spent?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The thing for us to do is to be certain that when the investigation comes, as it surely will come, we shall be prepared to meet it and will be prepared to show that we were justified in spending every dollar that was spent. But we cannot permit that consideration to interfere with the program. This is one of the times we cannot stop to count the cost. We cannot take the chance European countries took. We must be prepared. We have only ourselves to depend on. We are the last line of defense. There is nobody back of us. There are no allies that we can call upon. We stand with our backs against the wall. We have only America to depend upon, and America alone.

And these post-war questions of after-war economies may for the present take care of themselves. If America can meet successfully the problems of the present crisis, she can meet successfully any after-war problems which may arise. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For contingencies of the Army, \$10,000.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time solely for the purpose of calling to the attention of the membership a matter which is deemed by the naval authorities in charge of the Corpus Christi Naval Air Training Station to be one of vital importance. It so happens that Admiral Towers and Admiral Moreell appeared before the committee in support of an item of \$3,000,000 additional to the \$25,000,000 which was appropriated by the Congress in the last major appropriation bill for the Navy.

At the time the naval estimates were made up the Navy Department estimated originally the sum of \$26,650,000 for this project, and an additional sum somewhat in excess of \$1,000,000 for the acquisition of land in connection with the project. For some reason or other in the presentation of the matter to the Budget it was apparently deemed that this matter could go over until Congress met again in January; at least, no other reason was assigned.

The present naval air training program calls for the intake of 800 student flyers per month, 300 of whom are to be trained at Pensacola, Jacksonville, Miami, Corey Field, and Selfridge Field; 200 more at Jacksonville, Miami, Corey Field, and Selfridge; and 300 to be trained at the naval air training station now in the process of being erected at Corpus Christi, Tex., my home town.

I want to assure the Committee, first of all, that my interest in this item has no local color whatsoever. The statement I am making here has to do with the effect of the failure to

provide this \$3,000,000 extra in this particular bill on the preparations program for the defense of our country.

Speed, Mr. Chairman, is of the very essence of the situation. Failure to provide the additional field authorized in the original plan came about by reason of the fact that when the costs were finally estimated carefully and accurately it was found they would have to leave one of the three primary fields out. Three primary fields were originally contemplated and set out in the plans and specifications approved.

Corpus Christi happens to be the only naval air training station where complete training is afforded from primary grades on through to the finished flyer.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEBERG. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I would like to correct the gentleman in one of his statements. Admiral Towers and Admiral Moreell appeared before the committee in support of the item. The situation was that they appeared before the committee in support of other items.

Mr. KLEBERG. That is right.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The question of Corpus Christi came up and, as will be seen from pages 20 and 21 of the hearings, I asked Admiral Towers about the situation at Corpus Christi and he said that it was vitally necessary to their program and he was unable to understand why it had not been approved by the Budget.

The committee did not put it in the bill because the Budget had not approved it. We understood that the matter was taken under consideration by the Budget. But it was shown by both Admiral Towers and Admiral Moreell that they regarded it as a vitally essential item.

Mr. KLEBERG. I thank my colleague very much for his contribution.

In conclusion I have this to say, Mr. Chairman: The situation with reference to this particular item is now under consideration and it is hoped that the Budget will send up a suitable recommendation to the Senate where this item can and should be included; and I express the hope that when the conferees meet, if this item is put in the bill, that it will receive favorable consideration.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KLEBERG. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I should say, in justice to the gentleman from Texas, that he has been most diligent in this matter and appeared before the committee in its interest.

Mr. KLEBERG. I thank the gentleman very much. In substance the failure to provide the requested \$3,000,000 for the third primary training field will prevent the completion of the naval air training station at Corpus Christi. It will seriously impair that school in its program for complete pilot training. It will result in delaying without reason the full possible pilot output contemplated by the whole Navy program.

In the final analysis, it will preclude the carrying out of the present plans there to begin the training of pilots in early March of 1941.

In all, and after all, this \$3,000,000 additional will but bring the total funds up to a total only about 4 percent out of line with the Navy's original estimate for the full project.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, following my 1-minute statement this morning regarding the need for a chairman of the Advisory Committee on National Defense we received one of the finest statements concerning his point of view



from the gentleman from Virginia that I have heard on the floor of the House. It was with respect to what might happen after this war or emergency had passed. He made a fine statement. It is a great pity that so many of us have to try to say so much in the minute we are given occasionally, or the 5 minutes we have now and then. We have not time to discuss as carefully as we should like the things we have some knowledge of. It is for this reason that I have asked this additional time. I did not quite complete the statement I wanted to make this morning because my minute was up when I was about half way through. So I am going to ask your indulgence for a moment while I complete the statement.

Every man and woman who belongs to any organization knows that every organization must have a directing force to push its work. Without a chairman, without a coordinator, men work at cross purposes. They turn in performances of notable value, individually, and yet they may snarl the entire procedure.

Our Advisory Commission stands in grave danger of precisely this trouble. There is no reason whatever why a chairman should not be appointed who would in turn be directly accountable to the President for the activities of the group.

It is simply one additional illustration of the desire of the President to retain within his own hands the complete direction of every one of the multiple activities which he seeks to control.

One-man government is not a remote consideration when the defense of the Nation is so handled. There is serious danger that this one-man government is already here. We cannot risk this kind of danger.

That is exactly the way I feel about this whole defense program. There is a need for a head, there is need for co-operation, there is need for speed as the gentleman from Texas so aptly put it.

A distinguished Senator from Virginia, Senator HARRY BYRD, requested the Army to supply him with information as to the present needs of the Army and as to its future needs. He had quite a hard time getting that information. I do not know whether he has yet received it, but one of our colleagues the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] has received some information concerning the progress we are making. I want to point out to you some of the facts with regard to Army equipment that was on hand May 1 and compare it with the equipment, according to the Army figures, that was available on August 1.

For an army of 450,000 men they had 448 3-inch antiaircraft guns. They had no 90-millimeter guns. They had fifteen 37-millimeter guns. Of .50-caliber machine guns, they had 1,014. They had 38,000 semiautomatic rifles. Of 37-millimeter antitank guns they had 228. Of 60-millimeter mortars they had 3.

Now let me cite the figures the Army has given us on these items as of August 1 and as of May 1.

Three-inch antiaircraft guns: On May 1 we had 448; on August 1 we had acquired 471.

Ninety-millimeter guns: On May 1 we had none, and we had none on August 1.

Thirty-seven-millimeter guns: We had 15 on May 1 and 59 on August 1.

Small arms: Of semiautomatic rifles we had 138,000 on May 1 for 450,000 men, and only 149,124 on August 1 for 519,000 men.

We had on May 1, 228 37-millimeter guns, and on August 1 we had the same number, 228.

On May 1 we had three 60-millimeter mortars and we had three on August 1.

On May 1, we had 183 81-millimeter mortars, and we had 223 on August 1.

On May 1, we had 83 caliber .50 machine guns, and on August 1 we had 330.

Let us take field artillery. We had 141 75-millimeter guns modernized from World War stocks on May 1 and on August 1 we had 241.

Modern combat planes: On May 1 we had 52 and on August 1 we had 300.

For an army of 1,200,000 men we would need, for example, 10,000 planes.

Tractors and motor trucks: On May 1 we had 498 and on August 1, 631, and the need for that size army would be 140,000.

We had 485 scout cars on May 1 and 525 on August 1. We would need for the size army we are thinking about 2,600 of these cars.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. In fairness I think the gentleman ought to remember, particularly with reference to planes, that our plane production has been stepped up in the last 12 months from 250 a month to 1,000 a month. We do not have the planes for the reason that under a policy which I believe most Americans approve we have been letting other people have these planes. That applies to much of this material that would be on hand.

Mr. BENDER. I am glad the gentleman made that point.

Mr. ENGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL. May I ask the gentleman from Virginia if he has any information whether any of these planes, and if so, how many, are modern, up-to-date planes which contain self-sealing gasoline tanks and armored pilot seats?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. What planes?

Mr. ENGEL. The pursuit planes we are now constructing.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not know. I was answering the gentleman as to why we did not have more planes now than we have. We have been sending them abroad.

Mr. ENGEL. The gentleman said we are building them at the rate of 1,000 a month. I am interested in finding out how many of these are modern up-to-date planes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. They are all modern and up to date.

Mr. ENGEL. With self-sealing gasoline tanks?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not know about that, but they are the planes that our aeronautical authorities say we ought to have for the job they are doing.

Mr. BENDER. Semiautomatic rifles: We had 38,000 on May 1, and on August 1 we had 49,124. We need for the size army we are talking about, 500,000, and this would include conscripts and volunteers.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It ought to be understood that while the semiautomatic rifle known as the Garand is now stated to be by far the best military rifle of the world, the next best military rifle in the world is the Springfield-Enfield of which we have over a million. That is not stated there.

Mr. BENDER. The Springfield-Enfield? The Army is derelict in its duty in not supplying that information to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That information as I hear it read applies only to those items which have recently been designed and are supposed to be the last word, but it does not give an accurate description of the armament.

Mr. BENDER. I read 75-millimeter guns, modernized from World War stock. We had 141, and there are now on hand 241 modernized from World War stock.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is true. The modernized 75-millimeter gun from World War stock is a better gun than the 75-millimeter guns that were used in the World War, but the 75-millimeter guns that were used in the World War are still excellent guns, and they are not counted. I think we have 3,000 of them.

Mr. BENDER. Combat vehicles: Scout cars: On May 1, we had 485. On August 1, 525. The need for our Army, as is contemplated between now and the first of the year, is 2,600.

The fact remains that while we have appropriated \$5,702,000,000 in direct appropriations, according to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and that figure has

not been disputed, and for contract authorizations for the Army \$2,975,000,000, we are woefully lacking in the thing that the gentleman from Texas pointed out, and that is speed.

The gentleman from Virginia points out that we are manufacturing many planes but they are not being used for defense. They are being sold elsewhere for other people's wars instead of providing for our defense. What are we here talking about? We are a nonbelligerent. We are supposed to be nonbelligerent. You know the people of the United States have the right to ask their President, Where are we going? Today the answer to that question is clear. With Roosevelt in the White House we are going to war.

We do not pretend to be neutral. We call ourselves a non-belligerent, but with 50 American ships on the way to England, along with these planes and guns, we are heading straight for Europe. I know that our people hate everything that Hitler stands for, we despise dictatorship in any form, but I challenge anyone to tell us the difference between the Executive orders issued by Roosevelt and those issued by Hitler. We in America hate secret diplomacy, but every step in the negotiations between Great Britain and our Government is secret.

The order was secretly planned and secretly executed. We, the people, knew nothing until the deal was completed. I say to the American people that we cannot and must not tolerate this kind of government. Every one of us, no matter what his political views may be, must recognize that American traditions have been violated, flaunted, and ignored, in the Roosevelt order. We must stop now before it is too late. Roosevelt has started us on the road to war. There is only one way to get off that road. We must change drivers before the accident. We must change our national administration before it is too late.

Let me point out to you that it is 2 years almost to the hour of the Munich conference. You remember that week, the unholy week in modern history, the Munich conference, when the umbrella man from England was there along with the umbrella man from France, and the umbrella man from America was sticking his nose into the whole business and taking credit for the deal. While willing to take credit for the deal at the time, his associates disclaim all responsibility after the transaction went sour. I ask you to examine the files of the New York Times or the New York Herald Tribune of 2 years ago this week. He received great credit for his participation, and for his having at that time, as they felt, averted a war because of his appeal for these nations to get together and work the thing out. The thing that was worked out was the betrayal of Czechoslovakia. In that betrayal the countries involved in the Munich conference almost sealed their own doom.

I say, what about this secret diplomacy, and what about all this business? I say it is essential that we on the floor of Congress at this time consider the implications that are involved in this whole situation. You will recall that Bismarck once said that whoever held Bohemia, or Czechoslovakia, as we better know it, controlled Europe. Here was a small nation, right in the cockpit of Europe, surrounded by natural barriers of mountains. Hitler after he had taken possession of Czechoslovakia marveled at the kind of a line they had. It had the Maginot line beaten in every respect. Here was a small nation with 1,400,000 troops trained, highly trained, the best soldiers in the world.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I shall not object to this extension, but I may say to the gentleman that 20 minutes of debate by one speaker under the 5-minute rule is extremely liberal. I want the gentleman to have the time he wants because I am going to ask for 5 minutes to answer. I shall not object to the gentleman's request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. I say to you that here was this little nation with 1,400,000 trained men. In addition, they had 1,700 planes. Incidentally, the planes that were turned over to Hitler by Czechoslovakia were used to mow down the French, and many of them are being used today to mow down the British. They were used to mow down the Dutch, the Belgians, and the Poles. When they took over Czechoslovakia they took over the finest munitions works in the world, the Skoda Works. They took over 171 tanks, and the Skoda Works had for delivery to France over 70 tanks. The tanks they had for delivery to France were used to conquer the French.

It was one of the blackest pages in the history of the world when that little nation, our ally during the war and the ally of the Allies, was sold down the river, and sold down the river by a combination of leaders who were supposed to know what was going on. As the distinguished gentleman from Michigan pointed out, Lindbergh visited the plants in Germany. He was with an attaché of the American Embassy in Berlin, and certainly he could readily see and tell the people of America what Hitler was doing.

We in our short-sighted policy here have waited until the eleventh hour to rearm and provide for defense. We are paying premium prices now for defense mechanisms which, if Mr. Roosevelt had been on his toes and had made the request of a Congress that was his, if he had asked for the money, it would have most certainly been forthcoming. If he had let us in on what the picture was, or if he had known what the picture was, certainly we would have provided the money for him. Every appropriation bill for defense passed with very little argument when he told us that our country was in danger and our defenses needed to be strengthened.

I was in an elevator of the Mayflower Hotel with a group of men, and joined in the conversation with them. These men had contracts for war materials. They said, "Is it not a pity that we did not know this sooner. Our Government is spending double the amount of money for materials that it would have paid under ordinary circumstances."

Let me say this about the economic whirlwind of which the gentleman from California and my distinguished friend from Virginia, the chairman of the subcommittee, spoke. We are in that economic whirlwind today because of the manner in which the whole system has been unbalanced by spending us into a condition where today no one knows what will happen next. Our first line of defense is to keep our people employed. We find now as many people unemployed as when the present administration went into power. They have had 8 years in which to perform, and in giving an account of their stewardship they can point to 10,000,000 people unemployed today. They can point to secret diplomacy and the lack of knowledge of international affairs.

They ask us today to think about the economic repercussions and the position in which we will find ourselves after it is over. My God, men, what position do we find ourselves in today and what condition do we find the country in today? It is certainly a most unwholesome condition. Certainly, with the country in debt to the extent of some \$50,000,000,000, the woman who said she had a mortgage of \$48,000,000,000 on her home when the census taker came around was absolutely right. She now has a mortgage of about \$50,000,000,000, and she does not know whether she is afoot or ahorseback, and neither do any of the rest of us. [Applause.]

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I would like to ask the gentleman how he has voted on defense measures, naval appropriations, and expansion bills.

Mr. BENDER. I voted for every one of them.

Mr. HENNINGS. The gentleman has voted for all defense measures?

Mr. BENDER. Absolutely; every one of them.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to know that. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]



Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] has injected a partisan note into this discussion of a defense measure which comes before the House with a unanimous report from both the subcommittee and the full committee. There has been no politics in the Appropriations Committee in the consideration of these defense items. There has not always been unanimity of opinion on procedure or on amount or things of that sort, but the only inquiry has been what is needed to give us the defense that we think America ought to have. So I am sorry to see it used as a vehicle for any sort of political discussion.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Sure.

Mr. RICH. Did the gentleman say this is a unanimous report from the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is what I said.

Mr. RICH. Did not the gentleman hear the "noes" that were uttered in the committee meeting this morning?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Oh, the gentleman votes "no"—I hear that frequently.

Mr. RICH. How does the gentleman know that I voted "no"? I am sure there were a number of "noes" in the committee.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If the gentleman will examine the report he will see no minority report filed when the bill was ordered reported. Is the gentleman against the bill?

Mr. RICH. No; the question I asked the gentleman was whether this was a unanimous report from the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Maybe I am wrong, and I will seek to correct myself by asking if the gentleman is for the bill or against it.

Mr. RICH. I will tell the gentleman this: There is merit to having national defense, but I say you are going too fast to be sensible and you will see the time in the next 2 or 3 years when there will be extravagance in the administration of these great sums you are appropriating for national defense, and I think you are going entirely too fast, if the gentleman would like my own opinion.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I thank the gentleman and I appreciate that. Now, would the gentleman be good enough to point out what particular item in here we went a little too fast on?

Mr. RICH. Of the \$12,000,000,000 you are appropriating for war now, you will find that you cannot spend that money judiciously and wisely in the way you are trying to make the appropriation. I think you are not using good common business sense in giving these Departments, including the War Department and the Navy Department and the President, everything they want, and you have no knowledge of where you are going to get this money to carry on in the extravagance appropriations.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I thank the gentleman; and now will the gentleman go back to the question I asked him, as to which one of the items that the committee unanimously reported we should take out of the bill?

Mr. RICH. If I started in, I would cut every item down by quite a considerable sum.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman is going to have an opportunity to offer amendments all through the bill to any item he thinks is too much.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman knows that if I offered any amendments here on the floor this afternoon the gentleman would call in the New Deal organization and I would not have a ghost of a show to cut down any appropriation. Anybody who tries to buck up against the Congress we have now to cut down spending might as well go out and bump his head against the side of this Capitol Building here. He would get just as much results in that way as to offer amendments for economy in spending in this Congress.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think any amendment the gentleman would offer to cripple this defense program would not stand a ghost of a show, because I have too much

confidence in the judgment of the Committee to think otherwise.

Now, to get away from this bit of pleasantries with my belligerent friend from Pennsylvania, it is hard to follow the reasoning of some gentlemen who in one breath are complaining because the present administration did not start way back and build up an adequate defense, and in the next breath are complaining because now that we are building it up we are leading the Nation to war. I think they ought to make up their minds whether they are for it or not. Mr. Willkie made that great mistake. He said that the President intervened at Munich and sold Czechoslovakia down the river, committing that blunder that so many of us make sometimes when we talk about something without being pretty careful that we know what we are talking about.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. TABER. The only mistake Mr. Willkie made was that he used the word "telephone" instead of "telegraph."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No.

Mr. TABER. The rest of it was just as Mr. Willkie told it, according to the announcement of the State Department.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; the President did at Munich what the American Republic always has been in favor of in trying to use its economic and its moral influence to settle disputes around the conference table rather than to take them to war.

The President did at Munich what he has done time and again since this world conflagration started. He begged, implored, and pleaded with the belligerent war-hungry people of Europe to try to settle their disputes, but he did not undertake to tell them how to settle them.

Mr. JONKMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. JONKMAN. Is not that what they call "appeasement"?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Well, the gentleman can call it what he wants to. He can call it "appeasement" if he wishes, but after all, knowing the implications of this world conflagration I believe the people of this country would want to see their country use its moral influence if it could to try to avert this catastrophe that we are driven into and that now makes it necessary for us, for defense purposes, to obligate our Government for these stupendous sums.

Mr. BENDER. But not to intervene.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. But not to intervene. There has been no intervention whatsoever. Everything that has been done, so far as I know, has been approved, at least tacitly approved—maybe belatedly approved—by the leaders on that side of the aisle; certainly by the candidate for the Presidency.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Are there any funds provided for in this bill for development of the naval and air bases on the British possessions in the Atlantic?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does the gentleman know whether the Appropriations Committee has considered any funds for this purpose?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. We have not. We have understood that if such funds are needed they will be provided, in part, at least, out of the emergency fund that the Congress gave the President for emergency purposes. There has been no specific recommendation.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I would like to ask a question in all seriousness, if there has been any more investigation concerning this bill than there was on the original \$5,000,000,000 bill? The reason I ask that is this: Shortly after that, I would say about a month, a very well-known businessman came to my office. I have known him a long time and he is very close to people who have been connected with the defense program. He said, "What were you thinking of when you voted

for \$5,000,000,000? Do you not know that the sum is outrageous? I have talked to manufacturers who have been contacted in connection with these contracts. They say the Army does not know what it wants. They say that industry does not know how to accept \$5,000,000,000. They think it is a ridiculous sum to appropriate, and apparently there was no rhyme or reason for it." Some of us do not want to vote for appropriations and have that kind of protest made. The conversation I had with him led me to think that his protest was justified.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman was probably one of that group of citizens who will be calling upon Members of the House and Senate, where they have sought war contracts and have not been successful in getting them. [Applause.]

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I assure you that this information was not from that kind of source. It was an old, old friend; in fact, a lawyer.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Seven billion dollars' worth of contracts have been let to American manufacturers who have accepted those contracts. You will find in the Defense Commission, if you are interested, progress charts showing exactly what will happen and the dates upon which these deliveries will be made. Those facts were laid before our committee. The astute, able, careful, and cautious gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] was there to assist us in going over these matters, and, as far as I am concerned, I do not think there is the slightest doubt about the fact that the Army and Navy know what they want. They have a definite, concrete program. They are going to be able to award these contracts and expend this money for the purpose for which we appropriated it.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I think I ought to say to the gentleman that I have a great deal of confidence in him and I wanted that assurance from him.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I thank the lady, and I am glad to give it.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. TABER. The information I have with reference to most of these contracts is that practically half the funds which were carried in that \$5,300,000,000 bill have already been contracted for and operations are under way for the rest of it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think that is right.

Mr. KELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. KELLER. Is there any provision in the Constitution, or any rule of law, that would prevent any of the gentlemen who are making these criticisms from originating the idea, the necessity for preparedness 2 years ago about which they are complaining?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think the gentleman's question answers itself.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to ask the gentleman a question, whether he does not share with me a certain feeling of discouragement when the gentleman from Virginia and myself tried today to point out some things that obviously any American needs to be concerned about and to face, and then when suggestions are made that there is a terrific partisan point to be made about these matters from representatives of a political party which to my knowledge has never put forward any constructive program for facing these issues that we have presented?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think it is unfortunate to inject partisanship. We have got enough stuff that the two political parties can quarrel about—plenty of it. [Applause.] [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GIFFORD. I am led to take these few minutes because I am somewhat stirred by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. He says that we must protect ourselves and the whole Western Hemisphere. Send forth the news to all South American nations and Canada that no matter whether

they prepare or not, that we will protect the entire Western Hemisphere. And he also said that we have no allies we can depend upon, and that we stand all alone. It occurred to me that we have done a good deal lately to make friends and allies among the other nations of the Western Hemisphere. But he has proclaimed today: "You need not spend any money in arming. We, the United States, are going to take care of the Western Hemisphere." That is most disturbing to me. Does he discount the agreements made at the Habana Conference?

I have not allowed politics to influence me in these defense measures. I voted to repeal the embargo. I think that our first line of defense is Great Britain, and that we should help her all we can. That is my attitude. Politics or no politics, that is my viewpoint.

But the best-laid plans amount to nothing now. One hopeful sign I have. I recall to you the words spoken by the gentleman from Virginia yesterday evening:

The Congress should keep a firmer hand on the administration.

Did you read that? That is indeed encouraging to me. But day by day as the days pass something new occurs. Are we Congressmen not disturbed today after the proceedings of yesterday when Secretary Hull said to the French people, "We are interested in Indochina. All the material we can possibly spare will be sent to you. And we will now refrain from sending Japan war material." Do not all thoughtful men in this Nation foresee a newer and a greater peril by far than has yet appeared on the horizon? Are we to be held dumb today?

But diplomatic action always precedes congressional action, and all we can do is to mop up results of whatever decision may have been made by the State Department. But as I read that statement made on yesterday I foresee serious consequences. That there would be a tripartite agreement between England, the French Vichy Government, and ourselves to see to it that Japan does not further invade Indochina is apparent. If this is the understanding we are led in a little quicker by a back door little expected and from which we may not be able to retreat.

I am voting for this appropriation. I cannot, of course, criticize the President for this recent action, much as I blame him for many things relative to our economic tottering condition. But like the English Government, like the French Government, those in power should have insisted on preparedness for defense, although they might have been relieved of their positions. Their successors probably would not have done better, but they should have warned their people. I claim that we were not convinced of this necessity even 1 or 2 years ago—neither party was. That did not excuse those leaders who were informed. I do not excuse the British or French Ministry in power for not daring to tell their people of conditions in Germany because they feared they would lose their jobs. I have little sympathy for that lack of courage. Roosevelt ought to have insisted, if he knew; but he just talked about the edges in matters of defense, and what money we gave him for defense he spent only for light housekeeping.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does it not seem to the gentleman that it would be extremely helpful if the President told us just what he knew about the situation in the Far East and Europe? I believe everyone knows that the reason the British are doing so extremely well is because they have been told the truth by Winston Churchill. They know just what to expect.

Mr. GIFFORD. I am sure the lady understands that Roosevelt does not trust this Congress whether it be the matter of selling ships or scarce anything else.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.



Mr. GIFFORD. I want time enough to excuse myself for entering this debate at the moment. I am too much aroused over the situation to hold my peace. Rest assured, however, most of us are watching and worrying about our diplomacy. I happen to be in a position where I have been able to talk with men who know more about these matters than I. Thank God, I hope that those who are in authority know what they are doing. I am somewhat like the boy who did not know what he was fighting for. He said, "I am fighting for my rights." "What are your rights?" "Perhaps I do not know, but there's them that does know." I do earnestly hope "there's them that does know." [Applause.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in discussing this appropriation bill I want to read from the report of the committee two paragraphs [reading]:

Assuming the instant bill becomes law carrying the appropriations and contractual authority recommended by the committee, the Congress will have made available to the Army and Navy for the fiscal year 1941 a total of \$8,334,700,507 by way of immediate appropriation, and \$3,802,132,009 by way of contractual authority. The grand total would be \$12,136,832,516.

That sum excludes commitments sanctioned for constructing approximately 349 naval ships, excluding a number of small patrol craft, the total estimated cost of which, exclusive of the added expense attendant upon emergency construction, has been represented to be \$4,734,051,880.

A few moments ago the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] made a statement about a certain manufacturer who could not understand what all the appropriations were being made for. I want to say that I, a Member of Congress and a member of the Appropriations Committee, am baffled. I do not know what they are all for. We have not been told except as we get these reports. We got this bill in the Appropriations Committee and had just about an hour and fifteen minutes on the bill in committee. You talk about billions and say these are just the items we need for war, and they only came up in the last few minutes. A manufacturer in this country cannot fathom these great sums. They do not speak in terms of billions. You can see how much brighter and more intelligent the Members of Congress are than the businessmen of this country. That is the point I think the gentlewoman from Illinois was trying to make, the inability of the businessmen of this country to fathom what the Congress is doing. I share in that inability of the manufacturer who asked her the question.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I was additionally disturbed when, a few weeks later—I think it is within the past 2 or 3 weeks—I read in Collier's magazine an article by Davenport which showed his investigation of conditions in Detroit where they had attempted to fill defense orders and had gotten themselves enmeshed in red tape with politicians and were in a very great turmoil.

Mr. RICH. Well, that can easily happen. I am for national defense, and I want to do everything I can for national defense to protect this country against aggression from anybody, whether it be in the Eastern or Western Hemisphere. The best way we could do that is to tell the President of the United States and the public officials to keep their noses and their fingers out of other people's business. That is the first thing we ought to do, else we are going to be in a war in the next 6 months or a year. What business is it of Secretary Hull to go over there and monkey around in Indochina at the present time? He will get us into war with the Japanese. We do not want to go over there 4,000 miles to fight Japan, nor do we want to go 3,000 miles to fight Hitler. I say let us stay in our own back yards.

Mr. Chairman, we have appropriated \$12,000,000,000 for the operations of the Government before we started appropriating for war. Our income next year will be \$5,600,000,000, according to the present estimate—\$1,007,000,000 under the tax bill we put through recently and then about \$230,000,000 from another tax bill, called the excess-profits tax, which was recommended by the Ways and Means Committee. That

will only be a drop in the bucket compared with the amount we have appropriated and authorized. By the time the next administration comes in power—and I am sure it will be a Republican administration—we are going to have a real problem in America in trying to handle the finances of this country and make it safe financially to carry on our Government in a sound business way. At the rate this Congress spends it will be necessary to tax our people till they almost break their backs to carry the burden we are now imposing on them. We will break down financially unless we do, and that is a terrible situation for any country to be in or for any people. A sound country needs a sound government, a sound financial structure.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, while considering a little bill here for only thirteen hundred millions of dollars, a supplemental national-defense appropriation, I think we might listen to our constituents. They sometimes wonder what this money is to be used for, then wonder what the men are to be used for that the money will support. I may say, first, that I have voted for every appropriation bill for defense purposes since I have been a Member of this Congress, and I have advocated national defense for long years before that, for we must be prepared to defend ourselves until the world permanently abandons war as a means of settling disputes.

Now, let me read to you from a copy of a letter which was addressed to the Honorable Cordell Hull, Secretary of State of the United States, by a constituent of mine:

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I see by the papers that Japanese troops have marched into French Indochina and that you are again viewing with alarm and considering the appropriate steps to take to counteract this move.

I realize I am dumb, but for the life of me I can't seem to get very much worked up over what's taking place 8,000 miles from our shores. In fact, I had to look at the globe map to find out where French Indochina is.

I sincerely hope that you are not planning any drastic steps, such, for instance, as those designed to throw Japan out of there. If you are planning any such steps on my account (and for my fellow Americans), please drop the whole thing right now. Of course, I know there is tin in French Indochina and that we need tin. But did it ever occur to any of the bright boys in Washington that we could perhaps buy that tin as well from Japan as from the French (or the English intermediaries)? Maybe this is too obvious a solution and one not in keeping with diplomacy, but if it is, just skip it. As I said above, I'm just plain dumb. But, at that, I should like to inquire how many \$70,000,000 battleships, \$200,000 airplanes, etc., not to mention several hundred thousand lives, we can afford to spend in order to maintain status quo in such an ungody place as French Indochina.

While I am about it, I should like to inquire if anyone in Washington has ever given consideration to the possibility of cultivating Japan's friendship. I have an idea that if we would quit making faces at her and begin treating her as a civilized nation, we might find that we didn't need a two-ocean navy after all. But, I repeat, I'm just dumb.

And, by the way, what's this business of our sending the U. S. S. *Augusta* to Singapore? Don't we have enough worries already without deliberately breeding more? God, one would think we were a part of the British Empire, the way we are acting.

Sincerely yours,

CHAS. R. MCGILL.

Mr. Chairman, whether or not we agree with all of the sentiments expressed in this letter, yet Mr. McGill has raised a number of questions that will be raised by others. The people will want to know the answers. They are entitled to know them, for it is their blood and their treasure that may be called upon, and will be sacrificed in the event the United States decides to intervene in Asia. Would that sacrifice be worth what is hoped to be gained, and what is to be gained by it?

The term "status quo" is not understood by many people, but, simply, it refers to the condition of things existing at the time. When we say that it is to our interest to maintain the status quo in the Orient we then mean that it is to our interest to have French Indochina stay a colony of France, Java a colony of Holland, China a free republic, Australia and India colonies of England, and so forth. There is no question that it is to our interest to maintain the status quo in the Orient for the time being at least. That condition would give us assurance of oriental trade and commerce without inter-

ruption, and we need tin, rubber, silk, and tea from the Orient. The question is, however, would it be worth our blood and battleships and the aftermath of war if it became necessary to fight in order to maintain it, and Mr. McGill properly raises that question.

It is to our interest as a nation that peace be established and maintained throughout the world. When "things as they are"—the status quo—is challenged by some dissatisfied nation, then there is war. The rest of the world has now been challenged by Germany, Italy, Russia, and Japan, a powerful combination. They have determined to change things.

They intend to take from England her colonial empire, and they hold France and Holland and other European empires by the throat. They do not immediately threaten the United States, but because of their methods of doing business and their forms of government they are a threat to our foreign trade and perhaps to our own cherished form of government if they succeed in becoming the dominating power. For those reasons we hope that England is not defeated, and we render England every aid that we can without ourselves entering the war.

But in the Orient we have what appears to be a very difficult situation. All of these European countries either have Oriental colonies or hope to win them as the result of war. Meantime, while they are busy fighting each other in Europe, Japan is busy gobbling up the colonies, or at least pointing that way. It would appear to be in the interest of Germany and Italy and Russia, as well as of England and France and Holland, to prevent Japan from taking these colonial possessions, certainly until they can settle their fight in Europe. It would be to Russia's interest for Japan to be out of China.

Apparently the only nation of consequence that is not at war just now is the United States. We are known not to have ambitions toward establishing a colonial empire. Consequently it would be very convenient to these European nations if the United States would engage Japan in a war, or at least prevent Japan from doing any colony gobbling until the war in Europe is over and those countries have a chance to again center their attention in the Orient.

Of course, Germany would also like to do something that would prevent us giving aid to England. If the United States could just be gotten into war with Japan, then aid to England would have to be curtailed, so Germany would have a double purpose in fomenting a war between the United States and Japan.

It is quite evident that we in this country are in a most dangerous situation. For a long time we have been on the slippery path toward war, and yet we have done very little to prepare for it until quite recently. Now we are engaged in an hysterical scramble for preparedness which may lead us beyond our desires.

I do not claim to know the answers, but I have an idea that for our own welfare and for the future welfare of the world as well, we should not permit ourselves to engage in any war unless it be brought to us in the Western Hemisphere; that we should not attempt to settle the questions in the Orient nor to aggravate the frictions there, but to concentrate on rehabilitating our own country, our own economy, our own defenses, and continue to give such aid as we rightly can to Great Britain.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have been surprised at the criticisms of a great many Members of this House when they talk constantly about what Roosevelt might have done 2 years ago, what he might have recommended, and when I recall especially that there is no provision in the Constitution, no law, no rule, that I know of or have ever heard of that would have prevented those brilliant gentlemen themselves from raising this question of the necessity of a powerful preparedness for defense 2 years ago. In looking up the RECORD, I have not found a single one of these gentlemen critics who had anything to say on that subject.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I ask that the gentleman look at the discussion that took place between the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] and myself 2 years ago with reference to an appropriation for airplanes and flying fortresses.

Mr. KELLER. Of course, we have been talking about airplanes for a good many years. I am talking about the matter of general defense as we are doing it now.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the gentleman will look at the RECORD he will find the answer.

Mr. KELLER. If the gentleman from South Dakota and the gentleman from Arkansas talked sensibly on that subject 2 years ago; they are the most distinguished men in this House on that subject, and I take off my hat to both of them, if they really did.

But I repeat that what the American people ought to see is these gentlemen who are pushing out these criticisms on Mr. Roosevelt for not seeing and not announcing and not "telling a cockeyed world all about it." None of these critics did it; yet there was no law preventing their doing it. If they had so much brains to foresee it, why did not they do it? They are Members of this House, and some of them are bragging considerably about the duty of this House to do these very things. I should have been delighted to join with them, because before very many Members of this House here now saw it I not only wrote on the subject but wrote a bill covering the subject of preparedness in this country at the request of Senator Chamberlain, of Oregon, chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, in February 1916. I know a little bit about it, not a lot, because I do not believe anybody knows too much. But I am getting tired of the criticism here of the gentlemen who are so eternally criticizing the administration, when they had the same opportunity and never used it at all. They are demonstrating how much better their hindsight is than their foresight has been.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL. I made a speech in 1937 on the floor of this House on preparedness, a speech which the Chief of Staff and the Army officials all received.

Mr. KELLER. Fine. I sent out 5,000 of them, and I am not up here bragging about foreseeing it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield for a question, not for a speech.

Mr. RICH. In the appropriations for the War and the Navy Departments 2 and 3 years ago it was discussed on the floor of the House that we needed a larger air force and less naval construction and less money spent in other ways, but they did not seem to take to that, because nobody wanted to increase our air force.

Mr. KELLER. I said I would yield for a question, but not for a speech.

Mr. RICH. They have taken advantage of that. The gentleman knows that an air force and mechanized warfare, according to Hitler's results, are the things that made Hitler's army great.

Mr. KELLER. If the gentleman will permit me to suggest, something like 15 years ago, at least, General Billy Mitchell brought up this whole subject of airplanes. He should have been listened to and he was not. That was a mistake. The 12 years of Republican rule was noted for its complete disintegration of our Army and Navy.

Mr. RICH. It was not 15 years ago.

Mr. KELLER. About that time, following the World War. He ought to have been listened to. But what is the sense of getting up here and laying it all onto one man? I do not think this House, as a rule, wants any one man to do all our thinking for us. I am glad when the President leads. I am glad that he had the courage to announce conditions so dramatically that it awakened this body to conditions as they are, because if he had not done so we would be sitting here with our fingers crossed, and our eyes closed, and there would be nothing doing toward this whole program of preparedness, and there is no question at all about that. We ought to be honest enough to admit it,



and patriotic enough to be glad of it. I am going to go on insisting that we do see that fact in the case. I am glad he had the courage and the foresight to say all these things to us so that we could finally be awakened to the facts in the case.

Mr. RICH. Who is the indispensable man?

Mr. KELLER. Bob Rich, I think, to Mrs. Rich.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of talk about what the situation is with reference to national defense and what it has been over the past few years, and this has caused me to make a study of the situation, going over the appropriation bills of the last 8 years for military activities. With the permission of the House I shall extend my remarks at this point in the Record covering that situation.

While I have the floor at the moment I am going to call attention to a few of the items the Congress, with the approval and on the recommendation of the War Department subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, has been able to accomplish. It has made a material accomplishment in developing our military defenses. I am not going to make this political, but it is entirely a matter of what the Congress has done.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman says he is not going to make it political. I am sure he would not, and I am sure what the gentleman will put in the Record will be very enlightening. However, it will be more enlightening if the gentleman will go back through the three administrations prior to 8 years ago and put in the Record what was done during that period.

Mr. TABER. At a time when we were protected by disarmament treaties and when we did not have the Hitler menace to contend with? We have had the Hitler menace to contend with the last 7 years.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. The gentleman has tried to bring politics into what I was trying to bring out as a development of Congress. I will not yield to anyone else to interfere with what I intend to say. Any time anybody tries to get the truth out here somebody tries in some cheap way or other to bring politics into it.

I am going to tell you a few of the things the Congress has done. In the 1934 bill over \$9,000,000 was added on the recommendation of the House Appropriations Committee to build up the National Guard, at the time the President recommended a cut of \$4,000,000. In the 1935 bill a start on mechanization of a substantial character was made when for combat automobiles and tanks the Congress added to the recommendations of the President \$2,119,200. In the same year an increase beyond the President's request for experimental and development work in connection with airplanes of upward of \$1,000,000 was provided. In connection with the procurement of airplanes, Congress also revised the number of planes to be purchased so that those obtained would be more useful and more suitable for defense purposes. Congress provided for continuing the work of the Chemical Warfare Service upon an increased basis, and refused to swallow a cut proposed by the President of 33 1/3 percent.

In 1936 the Army training pay for the National Guard was again increased and the equipment for the guard was increased. Amongst the increased activities of the Department there was \$475,000 provided above the Budget for the purchase of tanks, a considerable amount of munitions, and helmets.

Under the Air Corps nearly \$5,000,000 additional was provided for 97 planes in addition to those recommended by the President.

It made a second forward step in forcing a clean-up of overage officers which the Department had neglected for many years.

In this bill, the 1936 bill, Congress also provided a larger expenditure for the upkeep of military posts.

In the 1937 bill a program for improving the seacoast defenses, involving \$6,725,000, was incorporated, for which the President made no recommendation, and they also provided \$1,300,000, not recommended by the Budget, for modernizing the artillery of the National Guard and increasing its strength by adding additional contractual authority for the purchase of 58 additional planes to those already recommended.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. In the 1938 bill for the Air Corps, \$6,783,000 was provided in contractual authority for the purpose of providing for an increase in cost of planes which had come about as the result of increased wages, so that the number of planes needed to keep the Army's quota up in full might be available.

This same year on the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee, additional funds were provided to recondition 800 of the 75-millimeter guns so that these guns might be modern and up to date. This was also without a recommendation of the Budget.

Another increase was provided in that bill of \$800,000 above the figures recommended by the President so that this work might move along promptly and in good order.

The amount of the President's recommendations for the National Guard was increased for ammunition and modernizing equipment and guns by \$1,468,000.

In the 1939 bill the work of the Ordnance Corps seemed to be lagging and reappropriations of \$1,249,000 were necessary because of the failure of the Department to use the funds provided.

Now, in spite of all these things that the Congress had done, in addition to the recommendations of the President, and every one of them along vital lines, the Army subcommittee was told a couple of years ago that our research and development work was 5 years behind the Germans. Every single item that has been requested by the President to advance these things has been done. In addition to that, in this period that we are in now, since the 1st of January, the Congress, of its own motion, has provided funds on the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee for adding to the Regular Army 95,000 troops. It has, without a recommendation from the President, added \$128,000,000 for the housing of the National Guard, and it has provided every single thing that seemed to be needed and that could in any way be thought of.

It seems to me that while, perhaps, Congress has not known everything that should have been done and has not appropriated every dollar that the most far-seeing person might have suggested, yet the Congress has gone ahead of the President and the Budget in every essential item of national defense. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, permit me to implement the remarks of the gentleman from New York and to express this thing in a rather compact way.

The first thing that the Members should have in mind is the question of what funds were requested by the President

and the Budget Bureau for national defense. The second question is how much did the Congress provide, and the third question is what was the thinking and the demands of the country in relation to this problem?

Two months ago I addressed myself to this question on the floor of the House, and after obtaining the figures from the War Department itself indicated that for the 8 years, including the fiscal year 1933, the Budget Bureau and the President requested of the Congress substantially three and three-quarters billion dollars for the Army. Of that amount we gave them everything except 1 percent. We cut off only \$37,000,000. Consequently, if there were any deficiencies or inadequacies in this whole defense structure, the blame must be laid on the doorstep of the Budget Bureau, which is the mouthpiece or instrumentality of the President of the United States and which occupies a spot in the Executive Offices. That is an answer in itself.

On the third question, what was the thinking of the country on national defense; there are folks, you know, who believe in the infallibility of the Gallup poll, and it is rather interesting sometimes to go back and see what they said 2 or 3 years ago.

You know this is the second anniversary of Munich, and 8 months before Munich, in January of 1933, the Gallup poll submitted this question to the people:

Should the United States build a larger Navy?

The answer was 74 percent in the affirmative.

Should the United States increase the strength of its Army?

The answer was 69 percent in the affirmative.

Should the United States enlarge its air force?

The answer to that was 80 percent in the affirmative.

This was 8 months before Munich, in January of 1933, and three times in that year the same proposals were submitted to the people of the country, and in each succeeding poll the percentage in the affirmative increased.

The people of the country were thinking ahead of the President of the United States on the whole question of national defense long before the Munich matter ever acutely crystallized the sentiment and made that poll go even higher. So that the people and the Congress were alert to the situation. They gave the President substantially what he wanted, and if there is any culpability, let it not be laid upon the doorstep of the legislative branch of the Government.

Mr. HORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HORTON. Have you any figures that would show what the Army and Navy requested of the Budget, which is a request to the President?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was speaking of the Military Establishment and indicating what came up here in the form of requests through the Budget Bureau.

Mr. HORTON. I do not mean that. I want to know what the Army and the Navy requested of the Bureau of the Budget; not what the Budget requested of the Congress. It seems to me that is the point, because the President was advised by the Army and the Navy of their requirements. Did the President in his message to the Congress indicate the requests of the Army and the Navy?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, no. They are under some interdiction when they come before the Appropriations Committee, and the only way we can get that information is by a direct question to the gentleman who may be testifying, asking him, "Despite the recommendation of the Budget message, how much did you ask for?" I do not know what the answer is. I do know what came here in the form of requests from the White House. I know what the Congress gave. They gave them what they wanted; but the executive branch was behind the thinking of the country, as indicated by the Gallup poll, if that is an instrument of infallibility.

Mr. HORTON. But you do not know whether the request of the President reflected the requests of the Army and the Navy?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The chances are that those who were on the military appropriations subcommittee and the naval ap-

propriations subcommittee, if they asked the question, could have elicited that information.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Just by way of pleasantry, does the gentleman believe in the accuracy and infallibility of the Gallup poll?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say to my friend from Virginia that I cross my fingers on that matter as to whether they are infallible or not. [Laughter and applause.]

Perhaps one should observe that the Gallup poll is a most engaging thing. Either it is right or wrong, and those who rely upon this poll to prove the weight of public sentiment behind conscription, or the popularity of a candidate now, can hardly argue that the poll was wrong in 1938 in indicating to the President, as Commander in Chief of the armed forces of this country, what the sentiment was in respect to a more adequate national defense. Reliance upon the poll now is a confession of dereliction as early as 8 months before Munich.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For welfare of enlisted men, \$2,572,594.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GUYER of Kansas: Page 2, line 25, after the heading of "Welfare, enlisted men", strike out the period, insert a colon and the proviso, "Provided, That no part of the funds appropriated under this head shall be available for expenditure for the operation and maintenance of facilities where intoxicating beverages are sold or dispensed."

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the amendment is not in order.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, it is a limitation upon an appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. Only to say that it undertakes to place a limitation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. There is no question about that. That is what it does.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GAVAGAN). The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair feels that as the bill under consideration is a general appropriation bill, appropriating among other things funds for the personnel of the Army, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GUYER] is a proper limitation upon the use of the money and therefore in order. The Chair overrules the gentleman's point of order.

The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to tire the House with an address on this occasion. I do not think there is a Member of this House who does not feel just as I do about the desirability of limiting the use of intoxicating liquors in the Army.

I call attention to the fact that the Vichy Government has placed alcoholism as one of the main reasons for the collapse of the French Army. It was saturated with alcohol. You could not expect it to win.

This has nothing to do with any radical idea about drinking. It is a question of the welfare and efficiency of the boys who are taken to camp. A mother wrote to me and said, "For God's sake, if you are going to take my boy to camp don't give him liquor there, please."

I think the boys who go to the camp should be protected in this way from the injurious effects of alcohol, and especially for the sake of the defense of the country.

After the surrender of the French Army and the ghost of France set up at Vichy, General Petain has imposed upon the most bibulous people on earth a regime of prohibition which if instituted 20 years ago the great debacle in northern France and Belgium would never have occurred. That French Army a decade ago was the best army in the world, and if the present regulations with respect to drinking had been in vogue the past 10 or 12 years there would have been a different tale about liberty-loving France. But as it is she has suffered a



far greater defeat and disgrace than at Waterloo a century and a quarter ago.

Today France has banished all liquors containing more than 16 percent alcoholic content and during 3 days of the week absolute prohibition. All this was the result of a military commission of experts reporting that alcohol had caused the collapse of the proud Army of France.

It was also concluded by this commission that one of the four most difficult problems facing conquered France was drunkenness.

The military leaders of the United States can read a lesson in the story of defeated France. With the recent development of mechanized and aerial warfare, total abstinence becomes a military necessity.

This amendment suggests that we do not wait like conquered France until the war is over to adopt a system for a sober army but to begin now as a necessary policy of the Army. This will conserve the health, wealth, and morals of the young men of the Nation. Gen. John Barleycorn must be driven out of camp and then put only sober generals, sober soldiers, and sober pilots on guard.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GUYER] will be harmful rather than beneficial to the men in the Army. This money undoubtedly will be used at new Army posts where the men selected under the Conscription Act will be housed. Is it not bad enough to take these boys away from their homes without depriving them of a glass of beer if they want it? I know I am not going to deprive men who might be required to defend my country of anything that I can get. Aside from that it will be in the interest of temperance to let them have beer.

The recreational facilities at the Army posts do not sell hard liquor. They sell beer. If you are going to say to the men, "You cannot have beer," there is danger that they will go out and get a bottle of something stronger and bring it to the posts.

There are millions of men in this country who drink nothing stronger than beer, so why do something that might result in their cultivating a taste for something they do not now want?

All post exchanges throughout the United States now sell beer. The placing of this limitation in this bill would not stop the sale of intoxicating liquors in all the Army posts throughout the country, but just where this money might be spent in new posts. Then again if they are not able to get beer inside the post, they will get it on the outside. The gentleman from Kansas knows that.

It looks to me that such a move as this might encourage the bootlegger to operate around the post.

I say the amendment should be voted down in the interest of the boys he seems to desire to protect. The more beer the young men drink, if it will keep them away from hard liquor, the better off they are going to be. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GUYER of Kansas) there were—ayes 16, noes 36.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For horses, draft, and pack animals, \$3,366,340.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

#### THE PLACE OF CAVALRY IN MODERN WAR

Mr. Chairman, there has been a good deal of misunderstanding, I think, as to the place of cavalry in modern warfare. During the hearings on the regular appropriation bill General Herr, Chief of Cavalry, in answer to some questions which we asked him, gave us some very interesting information. At my request, he prepared for us a statement on the

subject, incorporating some remarks made by General Reilly, Officers Reserve Corps, and some observations by Colonel Hardy, Chief of the Remount Service, relative to the use of horses in the Polish campaign. Under permission previously granted by the House, I wish at this point to insert some excerpts from that statement.

[Extracts of the comments of Maj. Gen. John K. Herr, Chief of Cavalry, before the Subcommittee on Military Affairs, of the Committee on Appropriations, March 11, 1940]

It must be remembered that instead of charging with drawn sabers or lances the modern cavalry rarely fights mounted; for the most part it fights dismounted. It simply maneuvers mounted in order to get advantageous positions.

There are times when mounted action or when it may be used chiefly by small units in the case of effective surprise or when conditions of enemy disorganization are such as to render it effective. Under no circumstances will foolish mounted attacks be made against overwhelming enemy fire. You must remember that in spite of the fact that the horse is rarely seen on the motor road, the man is also rarely seen on the motor road except when hitchhiking or driving a car and that horses may also be carried in motors when need be to reach quickly the theater of action.

After one arrives in the theater of action in modern war, there will be very little chance to use roads, certainly not in great masses or at any speed, and it is there that the great flexibility and mobility of horse cavalry reaches its apex of value.

#### FIELD OF CAVALRY EXPANDED BY MACHINES

It is true that the precise methods of employment as well as the scope of action of horse cavalry have been affected to a great extent by air and mechanization. It is also true that these new arms are able to do some of the things formerly done by cavalry, such as distance reconnaissance. It is also true that, by cooperation with the air and by utilization of mechanized cavalry in conjunction with horse cavalry, the scope and effectiveness of modern cavalry has been greatly amplified.

The missions of reconnaissance are amplified by depending on the air to discover the enemy main concentrations at great distances and by utilizing mechanized cavalry at a considerable distance and wherever the road net is suitable.

The efforts of the horse cavalry may thus be concentrated with greater effectiveness to the closer terrain and over all those intervening areas often heavily wooded and cut up by streams or gullies and which cannot be adequately observed by the air nor can they be combed by any vehicle of whatever nature. Only the man on foot or the man on horse can execute adequately these detailed ground reconnaissances and the man on the horse can do it much faster than the man on foot.

Also, it is only the noiseless horse patrols that are able to slip by enemy detachments, secure information, and return with it.

#### CANNOT TAKE PRISONERS FROM A DRIVER'S SEAT

In delaying action, although the mechanized cavalry can be used very effectively where the road net is good and the terrain suitable, it can by no means flow over the intervening terrain which is often accessible only to horse cavalry. It may be used in cooperation with the horse cavalry but it is not suited for this type of action when used alone to the same degree as is horse cavalry.

In the pursuit we find again that the power of destruction is greatly amplified by the use of the air and the mechanized cavalry but it must be remembered that these echelons are not alone capable of accomplishing the maximum destruction unless we have great groups of horse cavalry in addition.

The air will unquestionably bomb and machine gun disorganized enemy groups, particularly where they are on the roads or concentrated. Mechanized cavalry will strike them along the highways and on favorable terrain but an alert enemy, even though defeated, will take every opportunity to destroy the roads and bridges and other avenues of pursuit, even laying waste to the entire country in his rear. This will stop in great measure any pursuit by mechanized cavalry or infantry in trucks.

Horse cavalry, because it is independent of such means and can cross practically all obstacles is supreme. Furthermore it can take prisoners which cannot be done by the air and is very difficult for mechanization.

#### HORSE CAVALRY CAN COVER ANY TERRAIN

In spite of the unwise and ill-judged assault on the horse in war by many fanciful thinkers it is obvious that their deductions are founded on unsound conjectures and assumptions. They jump to the conclusion that because we have mechanized cavalry that it will exclude the horse cavalry. Nothing could be further from the truth because mechanized cavalry, although very valuable in increasing the scope of the entire cavalry, is in nowise suited to replace horse cavalry.

Whereas horse cavalry can flow over all types of terrain and is not confined to the roads insofar as the horse elements are concerned, and can be supplied by air or pack, mechanized cavalry is going to be chained largely to the roads and will not be able to maneuver over a great part of the terrain which is found on this continent and in this hemisphere. It has not the flexibility of

horse cavalry for each man on his horse, armed with his rifle and pistol, is an independent fighting unit.

It must be remembered also that, although armored vehicles will shed lead bullets, they are just as susceptible of being pierced by armor-piercing projectiles as is the man with respect to the lead bullets of rifle and machine gun. No armored vehicle has been made or can be made that cannot be pierced by armor-piercing projectiles fired by guns which cost but a fraction of the price of the armored vehicle.

Our cavalry is not the medieval cavalry of popular imagination but is cavalry which is modernized and keeping pace with all developments. We are particularly fortunate in having great resources both in horses and motors. There are more than 10,000,000 horses in this country and the motor industry is conceded to be the greatest in the world.

No one can read that statement, I believe, and ever again have the idea that the horse is as obsolete as the dinosaur—as one Member expressed it in the hearings on the bill now before us. There simply are some places that only a man on foot or horseback can go. The motorized cavalry is the adaptation of horse cavalry to the conditions of modern war.

The actual use of cavalry in the present European war has received little attention in the press. On this subject, the observations by Colonel Hardy and General Reilly are illuminating. They were supplied us by General Herr, and I insert these extracts from their reports:

#### THE IMPORTANCE OF HORSES IN MODERN WARFARE

(By Col. Edwin N. Hardy, Q. M. C., Chief of the Remount Service)

Certain situations, reference terrain, climate, mission, road nets, etc., give horse cavalry particular importance not only as respects horse cavalry itself, but as respects horse and pack artillery and horse transport. Balance and coordination is what we must have in military establishments just as we must have in all other activities. Each element and each type of weapon has its own function, and as stated above, must be able to perform some things better than anything else can do them.

We do not realize the great number of horses which have been used and are being used by the German Army since the outbreak of the European war in September 1939. Below are extracts from an article, *The Horse in Poland*, from the October 1939 issue of *Sankt Georg*, a German magazine.

"All cavalry will be interested in the part which the horse played on the German side in the Polish campaign. In this connection we may state without any exaggeration that the rapid advance of the German Army would have been impossible without the horse, and, furthermore, horses proved their worth in the manner that was expected. To be sure, the significance of the motorized and mechanized forces is unquestionable, but cavalry formations \* \* \* moved at almost the same rate of speed. In accordance with the communications of the headquarters staff of the Wehrmacht in its report dealing with the campaign in Poland, five armies took part in the great decision. According to this, we may assume \* \* \* that Germany used more than 200,000 horses in the campaign in Poland and that this large number made possible the pace of advance of the attacking armies."

The report of the German headquarters staff dealing with the campaign recognized horse cavalry in a special manner by saying:

"Division commanders expressed particular appreciation of the activity of their cavalry in their reports to the Fuehrer, who was on the battlefield with his soldiers. We also have reports of conspicuous cavalry actions led by separate squadrons. As an example, a squadron in the South Army, led by a well-known race-horse rider, boldly attacked a Polish battery set up on difficult terrain (in a great vineyard, rising terracelike) and captured it. The losses were small in spite of a direct hit within the squadron.

"When the weather (which during the main was extremely favorable and did not offer any obstacles to the advance of the motorized and mechanized units) became bad during the final concluding operations, cavalry and horse-drawn battalions came more into their own."

The above supplies us with the most recent examples of the use of horses in modern warfare as we are as yet without reports as to horse activities in the Battle of Flanders and the Battle of France. There were noticed, however, among the first pictures of the German Army to be received from France after its capitulation, those of horse cavalry, horse artillery, and horse transport marching through the streets of Paris.

The composition of an army depends in great measure upon the theater of operations in which that army will be used. It seems improbable that any army of the United States will be used on foreign soil outside of the Western Hemisphere. If we ever go to war, our theater of operations will probably be in the Western Hemisphere, but it would be difficult to attempt a prognostication as to the exact theater of operations in that vast area. Let it suffice to say that the difference in terrain and climate existing in that great area, and the many undeveloped sections therein, will offer more opportunities for the use of horses and mules in warfare

than in closely organized and highly developed countries similar to those in which the present European war is being fought.

#### HORSED CAVALRY AND THE GAS ENGINE'S CHILDREN

(By Brig. Gen. Henry J. Reilly, Officers' Reserve Corps. Troop C, Cavalry, New York National Guard, 1899-1900. Cadet, United States Military Academy, 1900-1904. Lieutenant (second and first), Second, Thirteenth, and Fifteenth United States Cavalry, 1904-14. Captain, First Illinois Field Artillery, 1915-17. Colonel, One Hundred and Forty-ninth Field Artillery, and commanding officer, Forty-third Infantry Brigade, both Forty-second United States Infantry Division, 1917-18. Has seen combat in Mexico, 1913; China, 1925; Europe, western front, 1914-18, except summer 1915 when on eastern front; Russo-Polish War, 1920; Spanish Civil War, 1938)

Franco's pursuit of the Catalan Army was an excellent example of all branches—light mechanized, motorized troops, horsed cavalry, regular infantry divisions, pack and motor transportation and aviation—each using its powers to make good the limitations of the others so as to move successfully forward over all types of terrain and never allow the enemy to rest, reorganize, or settle down in a new battle position.

General Monasterio, who commanded Franco's cavalry, had definite ideas as to what cavalry should be. An old regular cavalry officer of the Spanish Army, always interested in horses, their breeding, training, and care, he knew that, after all, the horse is only a means of carrying a soldier and his weapons.

The author's first visit was made when Monasterio's cavalry was occupying a larger part of the loop of the Ebro River, the same territory in which the hard battle of the Ebro was subsequently fought. His headquarters were at Gandesa, later the high-water mark of the Catalan surprise attack across the Ebro. At the time of the author's visit, the cavalry was out-posting and patrolling the Ebro in the same way as the Union and Confederate cavalry often watched a river during the Civil War.

During this first visit, General Monasterio, as on subsequent occasions, expressed himself as strongly in favor of the American cavalry methods of equipment, armament, and combat. He said, among other things, that he wanted to arm his cavalry with automatic pistols, one for each soldier, as is only true in the cavalry of the United States. Apparently, the only reason he had not succeeded in doing so was because, with the shortage of funds available for the armament of Franco's army and air force, only the most essential weapons could be bought. He emphasized the fact that frequently the opportunity exists for a wide and deep deployment and attack at the gallop in which the automatic pistol is the ideal weapon.

Monasterio insisted that the western front with its parallel-trench systems had made too many officers forget that in the open soldiers are only human beings subject to the same demoralization and panic which throughout history have given opportunities to cavalry. Above all is this true when the cavalry attack comes as a surprise, or, when beaten troops are in retreat, worn down physically by the battle through which they have just passed and morally weakened by their defeat.

Both the general and his officers recounted numerous examples of successful surprise in the long retreat of the loyalists in that series of battles which began with the Battle of the Alhambra, and in which the governmental troops were driven from the Teruel-Saragozza-Huesca line to the Ebro and the Mediterranean. Captured batteries, tanks, machine guns, and motor transport figured in the booty. In the battles themselves the cavalry had never hesitated to dismount and fight on foot.

In the pursuit where the cavalry met machine gun and artillery resistance too great to overcome, aviation, by bombing and dive attacks with machine guns, furnished them the necessary preparatory and accompanying fire.

Each visit to General Monasterio or talk with any of his officers strengthened this picture of a vigorously led cavalry seeking the weak points, the flanks, and the rear of the enemy determined to attack and knowing that its limitations would be augmented by the Spanish aviation, and when nearby, the Italian light mechanized and motorized troops. Talks at various times with Italian cavalry officers assigned for observation purposes to the Spanish cavalry confirmed this picture.

Franco's resources were limited. In building up his armed forces he linked his efforts to the necessities. Franco had never been a cavalryman. Yet he steadily built up Monasterio's force from one consisting of but 5 squadrons in the beginning to one of more than 50 squadrons. Amid war, energy and money are not expended for such an expansion unless the benefits and dividends are apparent.

Spain simply proved once more the principle so often proven by warfare; no arm is independent of the others. They are all part of the whole armed force of a nation. The children of the gas engines are not excepted from this rule. They are merely the youngest additions to the family. Each arm has powers and also limitations. The proper combination is that which arranges the whole so that the powers of each offset the limitations of the others.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard people ignorantly remark that there were no horses in the German Army. From the foregoing statements it is apparent that such statements are far from the truth. From the best sources available, I have



assembled the following figures on the horses in the German Army:

HORSES IN THE GERMAN ARMY	
Cavalry division.....	6,000
Corps cavalry regiments: 14 regiments identified (probably more units of this type exist) with about 950 horses per regiment; total.....	13,300
200 German infantry divisions, mounted platoons in infantry regiments, 30 in 600 regiments.....	18,000
Horse-drawn artillery, 200 divisions.....	406,000
3,859 horses per division $\times$ 200 (total horses in divisions, including artillery).....	771,800
Horse-drawn supply units: The number of horse-supply columns in the German Army is unknown. Horse-supply columns are attached to German infantry divisions only in special situations.	

Total horses in army (horses in supply columns not included)..... 791,100

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us carries funds for the purchase of 19,802 horses. On the basis of the testimony I have placed in the Record, and taking into consideration the terrain which might be the field of operations in hemispheric defense, I believe that the Members of the House will agree that the proper balance of the United States Army calls for the adaptation and development of the cavalry as contemplated in the funds provided in this bill. [Applause.]

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CASE of South Dakota was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### MILITARY POSTS

For military posts, \$29,500,000, which sum shall be restored to the emergency fund for the President, created by the Military Appropriation Act, 1941, in reimbursement of a like amount advanced therefrom: *Provided*, That the appropriation under this title contained in Public Resolution No. 99, approved September 24, 1940, shall be available for all the objects and subject to the limitations and conditions specified under the same head in the Military Appropriation Act, 1941, except as otherwise provided therein: *Provided further*, That the last two provisos under this heading in title I of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941 (Public, No. 781, 76th Cong.), are amended to read as follows: "*Provided further*, That the Secretary of War may, with respect to contracts for public works for the Military Establishment, whether or not for construction at military posts, entered into upon a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis out of funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1941 or authorized to be entered into prior to July 1, 1941, waive the requirements as to performance and payment bonds of the act approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793; 40 U. S. C. 270a): *Provided further*, That the fixed fee to be paid the contractor as a result of any contract for public works entered into on or after September 9, 1940, for the construction and installation of buildings, utilities, and appurtenances at military posts shall not exceed 6 percent of the estimated cost of the contract, exclusive of the fee, as determined by the Secretary of War." *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War shall submit monthly, within 10 days following the last day of each month, commencing on or before November 10, 1940, to the respective chairmen of the Committees on Military Affairs and Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives a report of (1) all cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts concluded within the period embraced by each report, and (2) of all land acquisitions accomplished within such periods, such reports to show (1) as to cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts the object or objects thereof, the name and place of business of the contractor, the estimated cost of the contract exclusive of the fee, the amount of the fee, and the date of the contract, and (2) as to land acquisitions the location, area, intended use, the purchase price, the amount appropriated therefor, and the assessed value (first reports shall cover the period July 1 to October 31, 1940).

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCRUGHAM: Page 6, line 11, after the word "War", insert "and Secretary of the Navy."  
Page 6, line 14, after the word "Military", insert "and Naval."  
Page 6, line 16, after the word "report", insert "where such Secretaries are respectively concerned."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the last proviso here is language put in the bill to carry out the purposes of an amendment I offered during consideration of the bill for Army housing last week. At the time, it will be recalled, the chairman of the

committee, the gentleman from Virginia, stated that the committee wanted to keep track of these expenditures and would be glad to have these reports made.

The housing bill had been printed for engrossing at the time the bill was before us, so to avoid delay it was agreed that my amendment might be incorporated in this bill now before us, and made applicable to the construction and land funds in both bills. The language of the proviso takes care of that.

As has been pointed out during the discussion this afternoon, the day will come when the country and future Congresses will scan closely the expenditures that are made from the funds we appropriate today. We believe that there will be less likelihood of excessive contracts and wasteful expenditures if these reports are made to the committee chairman regularly. If it becomes apparent at any time, then, that contracts are being made at excessive figures or under improper terms, the committee and the Congress can take steps to correct the situation.

This seems to be the only way we can keep any check on the expenditures and avoid delaying the construction program. With the approach of winter it is essential that the housing and hospital facilities be made available as speedily as possible. I hope that not only the members of the Appropriations Committees, but the Members of the House generally, will avail themselves of the opportunity to keep track of these expenditures through examination of the reports filed with the respective committee chairmen.

By unanimous consent the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

The paragraph under the heading "Air Corps, Army", appearing in the Military Appropriation Act, 1941, is hereby amended by striking therefrom the words and figures "\$76,205,988 shall be available under the appropriation 'Air Corps, Army, 1940,'" and inserting in lieu thereof the words and figures "\$32,205,988 shall be available under the appropriation 'Air Corps, Army, 1939-40' and \$44,000,000 under the appropriation 'Air Corps, Army, 1940.'"

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time for the purpose of asking the chairman of the subcommittee just two questions in connection with aircraft production. Possibly the situation has been covered, but I did not hear all of the debate because I was unavoidably detained.

Could the chairman of the subcommittee tell me whether the bill carries money to take care of the situation for non-flying officers of the Air Corps?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Does the gentleman mean flight pay?

Mr. MILLER. Pay; yes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There is nothing in the bill changing the flight pay rate; no.

Mr. MILLER. I noticed there was considerable discussion about that in the hearings, and I rather hoped there would be.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. We provide for an increase in the number but not for an increase in the pay.

Mr. MILLER. The pay still stands at \$720?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MILLER. The other question I desired to ask has to do with the \$180,000,000 to speed up the aircraft program. I take it, of course, the whole amount is not in the bill; but is any of it?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The whole amount is in here.

Mr. MILLER. If I am correct in my recollection, \$180,000,000 was asked for.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Sixty million dollars in cash for the Air Corps and \$90,000,000 under the head of expediting production. There is contractual authority of like amounts under both heads. Part of it is for expediting plant expansion and part for production of aircraft, but the full Budget recommendation was granted by the committee.

Mr. MILLER. In the hearings the case was made out that in order to speed up the program it was now absolutely necessary to put on two, and in some cases three shifts, which

would involve a higher cost of labor. I believe, if I recall correctly, the increased cost was 5 cents per hour. I am at a loss to understand why the taxpayers of the United States should pay that increased cost for aircraft procurement at a time when the manufacturers are shipping their normal production out of the country. In other words, if anybody is going to pay a bonus for production, it seems to me it should be paid by foreign governments, and that our Government should have the advantage of their normal production plus their increased facilities.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman, of course, must understand that foreign purchasers are paying for what they get, and if the aircraft factories are working overtime in the production of planes for foreign governments they are paying for the overtime.

Mr. MILLER. Yes; but we are paying this increased price for speed at a time when we are allowing manufacturers to ship over there at any price, almost, the aircraft they are manufacturing to foreign powers. I do not see why we should pay a bonus for speed at the same time the manufacturers are allowed to ship abroad.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There is no way to avoid that, if we are to let the foreign governments have priority, which seems to meet with approval.

Mr. MILLER. That is the part I object to, giving them a priority when we have to pay a bonus of \$180,000,000. It is the question of priority that I object to.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. These foreign governments have already constructed tremendous additions to various aircraft factories all over the country. I have seen three of them and their construction runs into the millions of dollars.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Very large sums have been spent in America by foreign governments for plant expansion and the American Government ultimately will get the benefit of that.

Mr. MILLER. I am aware of that. I have one of the largest airplane-motor factories in the country in my own district. I know, for example, that the French Government put three and one-half million dollars on the line for that plant and they are getting all the engines out of that plant. But let us take the Platt-Whitney plant, for instance, with the British getting the normal output of that plant and the American Government having to pay a bonus. There is a priority clause in all these contracts giving the United States Government the right to step in and claim the entire production, if we need it. Now, if we need it so bad that we have to pay a bonus to get it, I believe we should exercise our priority.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations if the transfer or sale of the 50 flying fortresses we read and hear so much about these days was discussed with his committee? Certainly, not only the Congress but the country should be given the full details as to any plan for selling these extremely valuable and necessary flying fortresses. Congress has been twitted long enough of its ignorance regarding these matters.

Mr. WOODRUM. Nothing whatever of that kind was before the committee, and there is no provision in this bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I wish the gentleman would join with me in securing an investigation of that matter. It is very vital to us.

Mr. WOODRUM. I am perfectly well satisfied with the way in which the matter is being handled, and, as far as I am concerned, I am confident it is being handled all right.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman believe that our flying fortresses are going to be sold to Great Britain?

Mr. WOODRUM. I have no idea. In the language of Will Rogers, "All I know is what I read in the newspapers."

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman is chairman of an extremely important subcommittee, and there is no more important committee in the Congress than the Appropriations Committee. It is amazing that the committee has not been given full information regarding our national defense. If the gentleman has not considered the matter before, I wish he would consider asking the administration what it plans to do in regard to our own national defense.

It is vital to us. Winston Churchill and England have told the people of England what to expect. Certainly we ought to be told in this country what to expect. We are not children. Most of the people of the country are adults, and they are entitled to know the entire fiscal situation of the country and the situation regarding our national defense.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. If it is going to be our accepted policy that our first line of defense is in England, why should we not expect to go over there?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think we should find out what they plan to do regarding the matter. We should be told just what the administration plans to do, just how dangerous the situation is. We know of the transfer of 50 destroyers after the transfer had been made in exchange for bases. We were told then it was because we were receiving the use of certain bases and that our national defense would gain much more than if we retained the 50 destroyers. The Secretary of State, in reply to a resolution of inquiry presented by myself, asking if they planned to transfer any more military or naval equipment in exchange for bases, replied that they did not. It is not that I am against the acquisition of such bases. Far from it. We need them and should have them. I object to the method used in acquiring them.

I feel sure in my own mind, after watching events and developments, that some further trading is planned in exchange for bases somewhere else. I want to know whether the administration plans to sell our flying fortresses or other equipment. The Congress should be told whether any such trading would weaken our national defense too greatly. I wish every Member of Congress would join with me in continuing to insist that we be told what will be done by the administration in shipping our defense equipment to other countries. We should have the full picture before us.

Mr. McDOWELL. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McDOWELL. If the gentlewoman will recall, Members of Congress found out for the first time from the morning headlines that our airplanes were being flown across the Niagara River. Would it be asking too much to request that a committee be appointed to interview the press to find out what the Government is going to do next? Apparently the newspapermen can get information where the Congress cannot.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is absolutely true. It looks to me as if certain commentators have underground channels or telephonic communication, some way of finding out from the State Department what is going to be done before the Congress of the United States finds out. Indignation exists all over the country about these very things. If helping Great Britain is best for us, the people want to do it, but they are entitled to be told the truth, given the complete picture, and certainly the Congress is entitled to that information.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I want to commend the work and the interest that the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has shown on this question, because it seems to me it is a ridiculous proposition for the Congress to exercise itself about making appropriations, and not have a clear-cut determination



of what the foreign policy of the country is. I hope the resolution the gentlewoman has introduced will be given serious heed by the Congress, and that she will have support in her efforts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman very much. I know what he has done in that regard, and it is extremely valuable. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

#### EXPEDITING PRODUCTION

For an additional amount for expediting production, including the same objects and subject to the same conditions and limitations specified under this head in the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, \$90,000,000, of which \$2,000,000 shall be made available to the Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior, for the erection, equipment, and operation of a pilot plant or plants for the beneficiation of manganese ores and the production of metallic manganese therefrom by the electrolytic or other process, including personal services and other expenses in the District of Columbia and elsewhere for the preparation of plans and specifications, advertising, and supervision of construction; and for all expenditures requisite for and incident to the exploration of manganiferous deposits in accordance with Public Act No. 117, approved June 7, 1939; and, in addition, the Secretary of War, upon the recommendation of the Advisory Commission of the Council of National Defense, and with the approval of the President is authorized to enter into contracts prior to July 1, 1941, for the same purposes to an amount not exceeding \$90,000,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 11, in line 9, after "\$90,000,000", strike out all of the committee insertion beginning with the words "of which \$2,000,000" and ending with the words "Public Act No. 117, approved June 7, 1939."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, we were asked to provide \$90,000,000 to furnish equipment for plants largely in connection with the Air Corps, \$90,000,000 of cash and contract authorizations for \$90,000,000. There was nothing on which the committee considered it could safely recommend to the House a cut. When the full committee met, this amendment segregating \$2,000,000 of the money which was to be used for expediting production entirely, I may say, within the field of aircraft and ordnance production, was adopted by the committee and added to the bill. It provides \$2,000,000 to erect an experimental plant in connection with the production of metallic manganese by an electrolytic process. This item has been put in other appropriation bills as we have gone along but it has never been used.

For my own part, I would feel that I was breaking faith with the people of the United States if I did away with what I was told was an essential item necessary to provide the proper aircraft and the proper ordnance for the Army, if I took \$2,000,000 out of that amount and put it into this experimental proposition. It is entirely experimental. It is something that we do not know will work. It involves a very considerable item of money. It involves the construction of a plant at Boulder Dam, as I understand. I do not believe we are justified in making any such appropriation. If we were, it never should be considered in this way. We have nothing to justify the cut of \$2,000,000 from this \$90,000,000, we have nothing to justify the taking of this money out of a program for expediting the production of airplanes and ordnance material to put into this experimental proposition, which in my opinion is a wild-goose chase.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. With reference to the expenditure of this \$90,000,000 for expediting production, what was recommended to the committee that these funds should be used for generally?

Mr. TABER. That they should be used for expediting production entirely on the airplane program and on the ordnance program.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. All through the consideration of this bill I have been wondering if they were carrying out the suggestion of Colonel Lindbergh that appeared in the

newspaper after he visited the President last year. When the gentleman made his speech I wondered if that was related to this program of Lindbergh's.

Mr. TABER. This relates to a production program for airplanes. It does not involve an experimental proposition at all. We provided last winter, early in the winter, large sums of money for enlarging the experimental facilities of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and for the Air Corps and the Bureau of Aeronautics of the Navy, to go ahead with an experimental program of large size. We have no reason to believe now that more funds for that purpose are required. We followed the recommendations that were made to us specifically by Colonel Lindbergh himself when he was before our committee on that particular question. I hope that we will stick to national defense and not go into some experimental process and cut down the figures that are needed for the development of national defense. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have very great respect for the honesty and sincerity of the gentleman from New York who proposed this amendment. He undoubtedly thinks he is correct in his statements. Of those which he has recited, to the best of my knowledge and belief, most of them are inaccurate or are based on incorrect information.

To begin with, the production or beneficiation of manganese is not an experimental proposition. The experimental work has been most thoroughly done largely under previous appropriations from the Congress. The process is all ready to go into practical production of several tons a day in the proposed pilot plant. This process has been carefully examined into by the advisory committee of specialists appointed by Council of National Defense. This committee had the further assistance of a group of experts named by the National Academy of Sciences. They have checked up every step and made a favorable report and recommendations for procedure.

I first presented the matter to Mr. Stettinius of the desirability of erecting the proposed pilot plant. He referred me to Messrs. R. C. Allen and C. K. Leith, who are the advisory committee experts who have been put in charge of such matters. Their recommendation I have here. It reads as follows, reading only a small essential portion of the whole report, I quote:

Attached is a recommendation from the Technologic Committee on Manganese of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council, recommending the immediate release of \$1,375,000 to the Bureau of Mines for specified construction and experimentation on the ores of manganese. The recommendations for the expenditure of the remaining \$625,000 of the \$2,000,000 originally set aside by the act, Public, 667, will follow later.

We strongly urge that the necessary steps be taken at once to release the recommended amount to the Bureau of Mines at the earliest possible date in order that it may begin at once on the planning of equipment and personnel.

C. K. LEITH.  
R. C. ALLEN.

Those men are the experts who were placed in charge of manganese matters by the Council of National Defense. The opinions of the technologic committee are certainly worthy of credence. I am quite certain if the gentleman from New York knew anything about the details of the subject he would not have proposed this amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. In a bill previously passed we gave the President or the Bureau of Mines, I am not clear which, permission to use funds for this purpose, but they have not used the funds.

The purpose of it is to have the proposed pilot plant utilize domestic manganese with the strong hope that some of our low-grade manganese ores may meet the tests for high-grade manganese that we so much need in our national-defense program.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Yes, sir. And this is almost a certain method of utilizing the abundant low-grade domestic man-

ganese ores in this country, and thereby rendering us practically independent of such foreign supplies as come from Russia, and from India, and from the Philippines, and from Brazil. The metallic manganese also has great possibilities in alloys as a resistant to sea-water corrosion.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And is it not also a fact that in addition to the recommendation of the Advisory Committee, that the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Navy Department in its conference report on the naval appropriation bill and also the Appropriations Subcommittee for the War Department in its conference report on the War Department bill, each recommended an appropriation of \$2,000,000 for this exact purpose?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Yes; that is a matter of record apparently overlooked by the gentleman from New York when he endeavors to kill the appropriation.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I wish to state that I know of no one who is better qualified to speak in regard to this matter than the gentleman who occupies the Well of the House at this moment. As an Army officer at the beginning of the first World War he saw that the artillery and aviation program of our country was woefully short of these strategic minerals and that we suffered accordingly and that we may suffer again in that same way if we are so unwise as to adopt this amendment.

I want also to say that there are two parts to this great defense program with regard to strategic minerals and especially manganese. Of course, we may have to get them from abroad for the immediate occasion and have them in our stock piles. For most of them this is a precaution while we are getting into production. The gentleman has provided for that, beginning with the naval bill of 1937. At the same time, along with that, concurrently, we should develop home production now in order that we may have true national defense and that, I take it, is the purpose of this \$2,000,000 appropriation. This home production is as much a part of national defense as the immediate stock piles.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I strongly recommend the defeat of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York because I am certain it was based upon his lack of accurate information, and I am also sure he would not intentionally thus handicap our national-defense program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 6, noes 30.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the operation and maintenance of the Selective Service System as authorized by the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (Public, No. 783, 76th Cong.), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, lawbooks, periodicals, and books of reference, payment of actual transportation expenses and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses of persons serving while away from their homes, without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Director of Selective Service; and purchase and exchange, and hire, operation, maintenance, and repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, including one automobile (at a cost not exceeding \$1,500) for the Director of Selective Service, \$24,825,108, to remain available until June 30, 1942: *Provided*, That the travel of persons engaged in the administration of the Selective Service System, including commissioned, warrant, or enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or their reserve components, may be ordered by the Director or by such persons as he may authorize, and persons so traveling shall be entitled to transportation and subsistence or per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized by law.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the committee to some facts about the selective-service law or the conscription of men for the Army in peacetime. Here is an article from this evening's Star stating that recruits are

flocking into the Army with the goal of 375,000 in sight, and it goes on to state that the men are making application for 3 years of Army service in order that they may fill the quota that is necessary and that it will not be necessary to conscript men.

I want to quote a statement made by the Senator from Montana who opposed conscription in peacetime. He charged that a campaign of deliberate, premeditated falsehood had been used to intimidate Congress into approving the draft.

I cannot for the life of me see why the Members of Congress were not far-sighted enough to permit the people of this country to volunteer within 60 days or 90 days, with the idea that they were to have 1-year enlistments. Had you permitted that you would have had two or three times as many men as you would have needed to fulfill the quota of the Army, and you would not have had to go out and start up this Hitlerized form of government in America.

It seems to me that the light of day ought to be seen by somebody in the Congress when we are told that if you give them 60 days' time you can get all the men you want, but instead of that you had to drive down the throats of some of the Members of Congress, against their will, the idea that they have to follow somebody at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue who, if you do not watch out, is going to be the Hitler of America, and it is not going to be very long until that day arrives, when the gentleman who is seeking a third term is interfering with the President of the United States. There is something wrong in Denmark and I think we ought to have a congressional investigation to find out about this third-term candidate who wants to disobey all the rules and all the traditions of American history, and anybody who believes, Mr. Chairman, that he is the indispensable man—God forbid that the day should come when he will ever be put in the White House for three terms and, probably, you will all have to go out and holler "Heil Hitler"—God forbid that that day should ever come—"Heil Roosevelt," I meant [laughter], and God forbid that that day should ever come to this country. If you fellows are going to be hoodwinked into going down there and hollering "Heil Roosevelt," just remember what your constituents will say to you when you get back home.

Are you in favor of the third term? [Laughter.] Somebody told me to ask you men over there that question. How many of you are for a third term? There are about 25 or 30 in the audience now, and how many of you are in favor of a third term? Hold up your hands. [After a pause.] Four out of thirty. [Laughter and applause.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAMBERTSON: On page 11, line 16, strike out all to line 13, on page 12, all pertaining to selective service.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, this is in line with what I said earlier in the afternoon. The compelling factor 2 weeks ago to pass the Conscription Act was the fear that England would fall any hour. Then they were to come over here and get us immediately. There has been a wonderful change in sentiment in the last 2 weeks about the fall of England. If there is as much change in the next 2 weeks, before the conscription really gets into effect, the calling of the men, we ought, in all reason, to repeal this act. In view of the fact that we are getting volunteers and in view of the fact that England is disappointing the war jitterbugs by holding out, I think we ought to repeal that.

Then Mr. Hull hinted yesterday where this army might go. It might go to China. Then in cooperation with England they might go to the west coast of Africa. We are beginning to see now how we are being led into war through the back door. England does not need us so badly as we thought she did.

We have been fooled about the damage that Germany has been doing to England. The stories we have heard on this side have been very revealing in the last 2 weeks.



Mr. ROUTZOHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. ROUTZOHN. Did the gentleman note that the other day Major General Strong, Assistant Chief of Staff, returned from England and reported that England was going to win the war?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes; and he is a very distinguished authority. Another distinguished Army officer came back and said they have never quit playing golf in London. They have not stopped riding their horses. The bathing beaches are running in full bloom. [Laughter.]

London has not been hurt at all like we have been told she was. That was the compelling factor for the passage of the Conscription Act—that they could not wait 60 days to find out more about it a little while back. The sink hole of iniquity in a democracy is conscription in peacetime—and we ought to start to repeal it. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, \$400,000.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with the passage of this appropriation bill and the general discussion on the preparedness program which we have had this afternoon, I note that nothing has been said and no inquiry has been made with reference to the progress we are making in the Navy Department with regard to the construction of ships. There is no part of the defense program that involves more detail, administrative work, and greater cost than that of the construction of combatant or fighting ships of the Navy.

For the interest of the Members of the House, I think it might be well to place in the RECORD what the Navy Department has done the last few weeks insofar as building up our combatant-ship facilities of the country as a result of authorizations and appropriations made by the Congress within the last few months.

If you will recall, in 1938, the first 20-percent expansion bill was passed by the Congress. In June of this year, the 28th, the 11-percent expansion bill was approved, and within 5 days all the ships authorized under that program were contracted for by the Navy Department.

On September 9 of this month, the Congress passed the 70-percent appropriation bill, increasing the size of the Navy 70 percent above the point then authorized; or, in other words, increasing it by 1,325,000 tons. Almost immediately contracts were entered into for the construction of practically all the ships authorized and appropriated for.

I might say that at the present time that the authorized strength of the Navy is approximately 3,000,000 tons. When the contracts for six cruisers are awarded in a few days there will remain only 81,000 tons not contracted for out of this tremendous program of ship construction.

Today the Navy Department has under contract a total number of 332 ships, and of this number 17 are battleships, 12 are aircraft carriers, 48 are cruisers, 173 destroyers, and 82 are submarines. Of the 17 battleships, embracing all the larger-type ships, the last of these will be delivered in 1947. Of the 12 aircraft carriers, the last of this group will be finished in 1946. The last of the 48 cruisers will be completed in 1946, and of the 173 destroyers now under contract the last will be delivered in 1944. The program calling for 82 submarines will be finished in 1944.

This shows the very exceptionally fine work which the Navy Department has been doing in carrying out this tremendous program of ship construction along the line that has been approved by Congress during the period of the last 3 years. Within a period of 7 years we will have trebled the size of the American Navy from the present under-age tonnage of less than 1,000,000 tons to a total of over 3,000,000 tons, which, together with our over-age ships, will give us the largest and most protective navy the world has ever known.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, these facts ought to become part of the RECORD so the Members of the House and the American people may know that the American naval officials are on the job doing a day's work each day getting these ships ready for whatever emergency may arise.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Can the gentleman tell us what proportion of these ships are being built in navy yards and what proportion in private shipbuilding plants?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The Navy Department has been able in the past to do about 50 percent of the work in the navy yards. Because of the limited capacity of the navy yards to carry on the whole program it has been found necessary to enter upon a program of expansion of private yards, as well as navy yards in order to permit the consummation of a tremendous program involving nearly 2,000,000 tons of new ships.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I want to express deep appreciation for the statement the gentleman has just made. It answers a question disturbing the minds of many, like myself, living miles from our coast. His statement will be quieting to the perplexed American people.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Aviation, Navy, including plant expansions and facilities in private plants, \$15,000,000.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to say just a word about the work of the Appropriations Committee. I have been a member of this committee for 20 years. In all that time the committee never has worked as hard in any previous year or put in as many days as it has this year. All the members of the committee deserve the thanks not only of the House and the Congress but of the American people for their loyal service day after day, holding hearings, and giving exhaustive consideration to the thousands of items involved in the appropriations for the activities of our Government and particularly the large amounts for the defense program.

When this Congress adjourns or recesses from its labors, temporarily or finally for the session, whatever it may be, I will, of course, as chairman, put in the RECORD an official statement summarizing and classifying the appropriations of this session.

I can say to you in advance in a preliminary way in round figures that the total direct appropriations carried in bills already enacted and in process of enactment at this session, including the amounts in the first civil functions appropriation bill, 1941, now in the Senate, and the third supplemental national-defense appropriation bill, 1941, now before you, amount to approximately \$15,000,000,000. In addition to this sum there is the total of \$1,825,000,000 permanent appropriations—other than trust funds. These two sums make a total of direct appropriations of \$16,825,000,000. These figures include supplemental and deficiency amounts for the fiscal year 1940 as well as the appropriations made for the fiscal year 1941.

Of this total of \$16,825,000,000 for this session thus far, approximately \$8,611,000,000, or more than half of the direct appropriations, has been granted to the Army and Navy for national defense and in addition to this latter sum civil activities of the Government contributing directly and vitally to the national-defense program have received, or will receive, approximately \$398,000,000.

The total of \$16,800,000,000 does not include permanent trust-fund appropriations of approximately \$2,149,000,000 which are payable from the trust-fund receipts, but does include over \$815,000,000 for the Postal Service, which is largely payable from the postal revenues.

In addition to the total of direct appropriations, contract authorizations in the approximate amount of \$4,000,000,000 have been granted or are pending in bills I have mentioned. Of this sum, \$3,805,000,000 is for the Army and Navy for national defense and a large part of the remaining \$195,000,000 is for civil activities contributing directly to the national defense program. This amount of \$3,805,000,000 for contract authorizations for the Army and Navy does not include commitments authorized for the two-ocean and other naval ship expansion programs, the estimated cost of which, in addition to the appropriations toward them at this session, \$148,000,000, will reach the sum of \$4,586,000,000.

Summarizing national-defense provision by Congress at this session for both the fiscal years 1940 and 1941, it is as follows:

Army and Navy, direct appropriations.....	\$8,611,000,000
Army and Navy, contract authorizations.....	3,805,000,000
Navy ship-expansion program; long-range commitments in excess of present appropriations.....	4,586,000,000
Civil activities contributing to national defense.....	398,000,000
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>17,400,000,000</b>

In granting the huge outlays for national defense for the Army and Navy the Congress has not confined itself within the Budget estimates. Wherever the facts seemed to justify additional sums have been provided and these total, for the session, \$620,000,000 in excess of Budget requests.

These are preliminary figures which will need revision as the pending bills progress to final enactment. We are hoping this will be the last appropriation bill. If we stay here, however, there is the chance that we may have to appropriate further sums between now and the 3d of January. If this is necessary for national defense, we will do so.

I believe I express the firmly held conviction of each member of the committee when I say that our object is to preserve our country, our liberties, and our system of living and to go whatever distance is necessary in the judgment of our responsible officials and the prominent people who are advising in this matter. You all know, of course, that the President has called in a great many of the most distinguished people of the United States, leaders in all the great lines of agricultural, industrial, and social endeavor of both political faiths who are contributing their services for the benefit of our country. We appreciate it, and we compliment them for making that sacrifice and becoming dollar-a-year men for the sake of preserving our form of government.

I feel that the ends justify the means. I feel that we must first look to our own defense. When we finish, if we are triumphant in preserving our country from the maelstrom of destruction engulfing the world I feel we shall have the brains, patriotism, and courage to work out the aftermath, no matter what that may be. I believe that our present policy is to prepare for defense of the Western Hemisphere.

I want the country to know of the loyal service, the hard work, and the conscientious consideration that we give to all these appropriation items, and that these bills are the result of the best judgment of the Committee on Appropriations. The deliberations of our committee are harmonious and the members are rendering patriotic service. I hope I may dispel any impression that there is politics or demagoguery in the Appropriations Committee, for that is not so. The Appropriations Committee never has been a political committee.

I particularly want to express my thanks to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum] for the assistance he has rendered the committee and to me in handling these special defense and emergency measures. He has at all times been cooperative, painstaking, and industrious in these labors and has given wise, patriotic, and courageous counsel in arriving at conclusions. The gentleman is outstanding in his usefulness to the committee and to the House through the fine character of service he is rendering. [Applause.]

I want also to pay tribute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Taber]. There is hardly a meeting of the committee at which the distinguished ranking minority member

has not been present. In the great majority of matters he goes along with us. Sometimes he asks us to reduce the amounts. Sometimes we agree with him. We all admire and respect him. He is honest, courageous, industrious, and a great help to the majority members, and we thank him. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

By unanimous consent the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GAVAGAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 10572, the third supplemental national-defense appropriation bill, fiscal year 1941, directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the new majority leader tell us, if he knows, what the program will be next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday the Unanimous Consent Calendar will be called and bills on the Private Calendar will be called. There will also be one suspension, a bill covering an amendment to the Railroad Retirement Act.

The Committee on Military Affairs has a bill relating to the Home Guard, and if unanimous consent can be secured, that will be brought up.

There is also a bill that we are all acquainted with relating to the civil service relative to lawyers. It is proposed to call up that bill some time next week. There is also a bill reported by the committee of which the distinguished gentleman is a member, known as the confiscation bill that may be considered. Conference reports will also be taken up if ready. That is a general outline so far as next week is concerned.

Mr. MICHENER. We are primarily interested in what will come up on Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Bills on the Unanimous Consent Calendar and bills on the Private Calendar, then a suspension of the rules in connection with an amendment to the Railroad Retirement Act. If unanimous consent can be secured for the consideration of the Home Guard bill, that bill will be called up.

Mr. MICHENER. There is the civil-rights bill. As I understand it, there are three bills from the Committee on Military Affairs. One of them is the bill to which the gentleman referred. Another one has something to do with installment payments of draftees, and then there is another bill. Are those all coming up next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is not my understanding, whether or not other bills will be called up is something I



cannot say at the present time. I have given the gentleman the schedule for Monday. The other bills I have referred to will in all probability come up next week, together with conference reports. What other bills may be called up I am not prepared to say at the present time but I am prepared to state that the bills I have previously referred to will come up next week.

Mr. MICHENER. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

#### AUTHORIZING SPECIAL AGENTS OF DIVISION OF INVESTIGATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR TO ADMINISTER OATHS

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah submitted a conference report on the bill (S. 2627) to empower and authorize special agents and such other employees of the Division of Investigations, Department of the Interior, as are designated by the Secretary of the Interior for that purpose, to administer oaths in the performance of their official duties.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by David Lawrence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEONARD W. HALL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement recently made by me before the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech I made before the National Convention of Postmasters in New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning I asked and secured unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD. Since that time I have had a check of the remarks made and I understand they will take about four pages. I therefore renew my request to extend my remarks, notwithstanding that they run over the limit.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAVAGAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole today, I ask unanimous consent to insert certain tables of my own.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include a speech recently delivered by a former Member of this House, Philip P. Campbell.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]?

There was no objection.

#### MEMBERS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE ANTHRACITE EMERGENCY PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 564, Seventy-sixth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Special Committee to Study the Anthracite Emergency Program, the following Members of the House: MESSRS. FLANNERY, FLAHERTY, and FENTON.

#### SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDOWELL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, this body has appropriated many billions of dollars to be used to buy and to make supplies for the United States Army, Navy, and the Marine Corps, that the Nation may guarantee itself against the ever-growing threat of invasion from foreign enemies.

The city of Pittsburgh, which has been the armory of the Nation for more than a century, has received many million dollars worth of orders that range all the way from tear-gas shells to ship sides for destroyers and battle-ships. My own district has received, to date, approximately \$47,000,000 worth of orders from the national-defense forces. My people are busy up in Pennsylvania making the things the Nation needs.

We have the greatest pool of industry there in the world. We have there concentrated the greatest number of skilled mechanics the world has ever seen in all branches of the industrial arts. If a foreign foe were to choose one major spot in the Nation to strike a blow at the United States, he would choose above all others Pittsburgh and its environs, because the destruction of our city now could be the greatest blow at our defense program that could be wrought.

The day before yesterday this House passed, without a dissenting vote, a bill which provides a fine of \$10,000 and a maximum of 30 years in jail to be imposed upon any person who would willfully destroy or attempt to destroy or hinder in any manner the defense program of the people of the United States. This bill, when it becomes a law, as it undoubtedly will be, will affect practically every industry, utility, and transportation device in the Nation. It is a good bill, and it will undoubtedly slow down the activities of those enemies of the Nation who are now in our midst.

During the very brief debate on the bill, I offered an amendment, which would include among those who could be punished by the bill the members of any political party which was not altogether of our Nation, but which had branches in countries outside of ourselves. The amendment specifically named Communists, Nazis, Fascists, and required authorities in defense plants to dismiss any of these on their rolls.

I withdrew the amendment because the sponsors of the bill pointed out that it was not germane to the bill and that the measure should be written into a law of itself. That I have done, and today I have introduced a measure which should receive the approval of every Member of the Congress and of every loyal citizen of the United States, because it will legally prevent enemies of the Nation from working in any defense operation of our country and provide a penalty for those who violate its intent.

The reason for my efforts in the past few days are very interesting, and I desire now to call to the attention of the House of Representatives, the people of the United States, and in particular to the chairman of the Committee for the Investigation of Un-American Activities, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], and the head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Mr. Hoover, the following facts:

Within 3 miles of my home, back in Pennsylvania, is the Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., which is one of the most important plants manufacturing defense materials in the Nation. To date they have received approximately \$17,000,000 worth of orders that include in their list things that range from generators for warships to gun emplacements.

This company is one of the great manufacturing companies of the world; it devised and gave to the world radio broadcasting. It is equipped to furnish the Army and the Navy right now, and right now it is doing countless objects that are so very necessary to the fighting forces of the Nation.

In the local plant in Pennsylvania, which is located principally in the Turtle Creek Valley, there are some 11,000 employees. It was my good fortune to be born there and to grow up among these people. The employees of the various plants are typical Americans, loyal, frugal, hard working, and as patriotic as any Member of this body. They compose one of the largest groups of local organized labor in the Nation; and some years ago they organized and became a part of the

United Electric and Radio Machine Workers of America and affiliated themselves with the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Everybody agrees that the labor relations of the workers and the employers in the Turtle Creek Valley for more than a score of years has been almost a model circumstance. Strikes have been at a very minimum, labor strife is almost unknown, of violence we have had practically none, and our wages and conditions there are among the best in the world.

The workers of the great Westinghouse plants are good, faithful members of their union. Their official title is Local 601; and if all of the members of Local 601 were to be suddenly removed from active service in behalf of the defense program of this Nation, that program would be seriously slowed down. Everybody agrees to that.

At the present time there is a dispute between the owners and operators of the Westinghouse plants and Local 601 as to the signing of a work contract. The men are working and the plant is producing, but the contract between the two still remains unsigned. Now, my colleagues, the bizarre part of all of this is that the Westinghouse owners and officials are eager to sign the contract, and so are the men who work in the plants, but the contract still remains unsigned.

I have had the word from many of the authorities of the Westinghouse Co., high, medium, and low, that they sincerely believe that they have the finest group of skilled workmen in the world, and they are proud of their great efficient personnel. The wages and the bonuses that have been arranged by agreement between the owners and the men who work there are a model that should be copied by every other great manufacturing concern that exists. Hardly a man who works for the Westinghouse would tell you otherwise.

The entire situation presents one of the most pleasant pictures of labor relations and employer relations that exists in industry.

Now, let me get down to the milk in the coconut. Let me tell you why the contract between this great body of men and that great industry still remains doggo in the desks of the company's officials and in the union's desk.

There can be no question that a great mass of the American people will be astonished to know that in this great defense plant there are working and circulating every day enemies of the people of the United States. We know them; I can name them. The company knows them, and they can name them. The workmen themselves know them and they can name them; and still they are there plotting and planning and conniving as all enemies of the Nation are doing. They cannot be fired; they cannot be laid off. They stay there by legal right—by the right of the provisions of the Wagner Act—and if the company or the men would do the highly patriotic thing and bodily toss them out, both the union and the company would be subject to the provisions of the Wagner Act and could be haled before the National Labor Relations Board for judgment—and if we are to judge precedent—punishment.

I am one of those Members of this body who believes in the Wagner Act and believes it to be the Magna Carta of labor and who will vote to maintain it so long as I remain a Member of this body, and who voted to maintain it during my service here. Like all other great social advances, the Wagner Act needs to be readjusted to fit and conform with the American way of living, and it was unforeseen when the act was adopted by the Congress that it would eventually protect a very small slice of enemies of the Nation and maintain them in the places where they could do us the worst damage.

Local 601, with its 11,000 employees, is completely in the hands of a gang of men who are as "red" as the Soviet flag, although 98 percent of its membership are good, honest, plain workmen, who are as patriotic as the average American is, and always will be. The "reds" grabbed control of the union of this vital industry by reason of the traditional American carelessness and indolence.

The members of Local 601 pay their dues, believe in organized labor, and hope that their local is going to be prop-

erly operated for the benefit of themselves—and that is very proper—but, like too many Americans, when organization day comes around, and when it is time to elect officers and adopt rules, the great mass of the members are at ball games, or mowing the lawn, or doing something else. As a result, the union has been operated for some years with a maximum of three and four hundred members voting, and has fallen completely into the hands of skilled Moscow-trained organizers who now dominate its offices.

The president of the local is a sick man, and very rarely functions. The vice president is a native-born American named Logan Burkhart, who is a faithful admitted member of the Communist Party, and who also admits that his constant endeavors are in behalf of the Communist Party. The business agent-secretary and real boss of the union is one Charles Newell, who is a stranger to western Pennsylvania, who helped organize various communistic groups in the city of Boston and in the city of New York, and who was sent to Pittsburgh by his "red" superiors to enter and gain control of the great Westinghouse union. He has done a magnificent job for his Soviet superiors. He is running the union in the way that should gain him the highest Soviet decoration that could be granted by the Kremlin in Moscow.

Newell does not like the United States Government, and thinks it should be supplanted by that operated by Stalin in Russia—and remember that Mr. Newell is businessman of the 11,000 patriotic Americans who, by their own rules, that he has choked down their throats, are prohibited from doing anything to help themselves.

This Newell is a close friend of one George Powers, of McKeesport, Pa., who likewise has a throttled grasp on the throat of the great steel industry of that city, which has also millions of dollars of war-defense orders. Mr. Powers is an immigrant from Europe. He spent several days here in Washington as a subpoenaed witness before the Dies committee. The committee did not get very far with Mr. Powers. They found out a few unimportant things—that he had been a labor agitator in North Carolina, that he had the most magnificent capacity for forgetting that the committee has ever seen, that he could not recall the boat that he came to America on, and the day I listened he could not even recall the port he arrived at.

Last Friday night I sent reporters from my newspaper to a meeting in McKeesport, at which Mr. Powers presided in his broken English. After making the usual communistic harangue against everything that is American, his wife passed out to those who were present—and, again, who were 98 percent patriotic Americans—copies of the *Daily Worker*, which, speaking as a newspaperman, I can fully assure you is perhaps the rottenest, lyingest, smelly publication it has ever been my misfortune to read.

If we get into a war, I cannot believe either Mr. Powers, which is not the name he was born with, or Mr. Newell can want us to win it, because they do not like the Government of the United States; they like the Government of Soviet Russia. Like all other stool pigeons of the bloody Russian politicians, they hastily slide over the complete betrayal Stalin has given the Russian people and insistently pound on the theory that all American workmen are mistreated and underpaid.

These are the men who are empowered to call a strike. This is the reason the Westinghouse Co. cannot sign a contract with the union; and who can blame them?

My newspaper, the *Wilkesburg Gazette*, has been carrying the story I am telling you now for several weeks, and it may surprise you to know that I am printing the story at the request of the ordinary buck private in local 601 who loves his country. As the laws exist now, the only way these men can be taken out of power in these great defense plants is for the men themselves to do it. They have a reasonable, logical, legitimate excuse for not taking the initiative in the matter. They are plain workmen; they have to have their jobs; they cannot expose themselves to the organized ridicule and the persecutions that Moscow visits upon those



independent thinkers who dare criticize crooked labor officials. Thus they came to the only person they thought could help them in their community—their Representative in Congress—and in all sincerity and without political motive; and as a plain citizen of this country I am laying their story before this body.

The mills and the mines and the factories of my country have enemies of the Nation in them, and by God it is time to get them out of there legally without going through any of the extra legal and awkward methods of mass voting by the members of the union themselves.

In my home town of Wilkinsburg there is an organized bund, which, up until a few months ago, was a very noisy outfit. Being composed in the main of smart and intelligent Nazis, they have quit being noisy and I do not hear anything of them any more from themselves, but those fellows are working in those factories back in Pennsylvania, and is there any Member of this body simple enough to believe that they are not hoping for the success of their Nazi master whether this country is in the war or not? In the name of the honest workmen of Pennsylvania and of the people of the United States, I am laying this matter before the Congress for its immediate attention and asking that you do something about it.

My colleagues, do you know that there are now twice as many members in Communist and affiliated movements in the United States today as there are at present in the Communist Party of Russia? Do you know that there are over 610 national Communist and affiliated organizations with thousands of State and local branches? Do you know that there are over 300 Communist newspapers and magazines in the United States? Let me show you one.

Here is a small monthly newspaper called the Union Generator, the official organ of Westinghouse Local 601, United Electric, Radio, and Machine Workers of America. It is published under the name of the workers of the Westinghouse plant, but this paper is directed from the office of Comrade Earl Browder, of New York City.

Last week John A. Metcalf, president of the union, became alarmed at the situation inside his own local and he wrote out a statement saying that he would not be responsible for anything that was published in the Union Generator. The editor of the Generator, acting in true Moscow manner, refused to give the president of the union space in the president's own newspaper; whereupon Mr. Metcalf was required to distribute handbills up and down the Turtle Creek Valley, stating that he had no control of his own newspaper.

This Congress has taken longer steps into unknown things than any other in the history of the Nation. The Congress is going to draft the young men of the Nation, it has given the administrative branch the power to draft the Nation's industry. We have authorized and are building another complete fleet. We have given part of our Navy to England. We are shipping Navy planes from our own defense forces to another nation. We have determined that any person who commits sabotage can go to jail for 30 years. That is very fine and good, but why lock the stable after the horse is stolen?

Across the river from my district, night before last, a chemical plant blew up—nobody knows why, but the plant is not there any more. A few days ago the Hercules Powder Co. over on the coast blew up—nobody knows how it happened, but a lot of men and part of that plant are not there any more. Spies and saboteurs are clever men that usually do not get blown up.

It appears to me that the Congress of the United States had better take some steps toward drafting the enemies of the Nation out of their defense plants. I cannot see why any of you would oppose such a bill—just good politics ought to put you against the enemies of the Nation. These "reds" and Nazis and others of their kind are of a very tiny minority—they make a lot of noise, but thank God they do not control the country, nor its politics as yet. Thus you are safe in adopting a strictly American law.

My bill prohibits any Communists, bundsmen, Fascists, or members of any political party that has branches in any other nation, or any person certified by the Department of Justice as being affiliated or associated with any such political organizations, or even sympathetic to such political philosophy, from working in any capacity in any plant, utility, or transportation device that is connected with the defense program of the United States Government.

The bill, if made into a law, will clean out thousands of seriously dangerous enemies, and we will replace them with good, honest, patriotic American workmen. It is time to quit stalling with these people; it is time to take action. There is not a Member of Congress who goes back to his district that does not hear the question a thousand times, "Why doesn't the Congress do something about the 'fifth columnists'?" Well, here is a way the Congress can do something for the sake of our industry, for the sake of our national defense, and for the sake of our country. I ask you to support the bill. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Under a previous special order, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a newspaper article and excerpts from official publications.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

#### A FEW OF THE FALLACIES OF THE NEW DEAL

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, in asking for this time today I did it for the purpose of clarifying some of the issues before the people of this country and not for the purpose of making a partisan speech or a personal attack upon anyone. To my way of thinking, the New Deal is fundamentally wrong.

First, the New Deal legislates for the benefit of the few at the expense of the many. The expressed thought and philosophy of my State for two generations has been based on a program of the greatest good for the greatest number, and this philosophy has been impressed upon every student at our great State institution of learning. We think and we vote on this premise.

Secondly, the New Deal proceeds on the basis that the end justifies the means. This is basically wrong, and the results are already becoming evident in an attitude whereby many public officers no longer fill their office in a spirit of its being a public trust. President Roosevelt and his family set the pace with its insurance, mattress, and Sweetheart soap projects.

The Jeffersonian Democrats and Lincoln Republicans desire to preserve our form of government, its ideals, its principles, and its institutions. This is a constructive force built on fairness, justice, love, and tolerance. They realize this country has been made great and can be preserved by following these social and economic principles.

The New Deal Progressives desire a new brand of government, based on foreign ideologies and is one that has a defeatist viewpoint. The "superman" has been their need and now the "indispensable" man is their cry. This philosophy of government is diametrically opposed to the political philosophy of Thomas Jefferson, who had such great faith in the people themselves.

The New Deal Progressives say, "the last frontier is gone"—when millions of undeveloped acres lie in our land; they say "Youth, millions too many" when never before did youth have the opportunities of achievement they could have today.

The New Deal Progressive Party would destroy our form of government. It is a destructive force. It sings a hymn of hate; it pits class against class; it thrives on spite, envy, hate, intolerance, and greed.

The time has come to bring the Government back to the people and unless we do we will have as completely a totalitarian form of government as any European country. On November 5 we vote on whether to have a republic or a

dictatorship. On November 5 we decide once and for all if we are to have a government of laws or a government of men or man.

The New Deal is material, with little or no regard for spiritual values. It falsely claims that dollars mean contentment and happiness.

#### AGRICULTURAL FALLACIES OF THE NEW DEAL

First. One of the most fallacious acts of the New Deal occurred on August 26, 1937, when the rubber-stamp Congress passed Senate bill 2229, which permitted Members of Congress themselves to enter into agreements under the agricultural program in order that the Members could personally enjoy the benefit of their own legislation. Up to this time the law of the land would not allow Members to enjoy legislation which gave them personal emoluments, but the New Deal changed this procedure to enable Members themselves to profit. This type of legislation is a violation of the public trust and it was passed without the inconvenience of a roll call. It is in direct opposition to the spirit of the Constitution and the act should be repealed if the people are to continue to believe that we are being selected for the general welfare of the public.

Second. The New Deal confuses even its own members. On March 28, 1939, one of our colleagues, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MASSINGALE], on the floor of the House said, in part:

Let me tell you this: I hope this will be a lesson to the American Congress, to the American farmer, and to the American people as a whole, that we are going to abandon these foolish philosophies of trying to do something by cutting down acreage, killing cattle, killing hogs, and things of that sort, and restore the American farmer to the estate of decency, at least, that he used to have. We can do that. We can give him parity and better than parity. We can give him cost of production. There is a petition on file up here, No. 5, that will give to the farmers of this country what it costs them at least to produce a pound of cotton or a bushel of wheat or any other commodity that we grow on the farms of this country. Let us give it to him. We have got to quit this. Congress cannot go on year after year appropriating five hundred million to a billion dollars a year in order to carry out this darned fool philosophy that some fellow has picked up somewhere and tries to foist on the people of the country and make the farmers endorse it in order to get an imaginary payment. [Applause.]

Millions of the American people have Mr. MASSINGALE's views on this subject.

Then, on September 9, 1940, another colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERGUSON], placed an extension of remarks in the RECORD in which he tried to enumerate and count the blessings of the New Deal agricultural program. He gives it credit for benefits which have never been obtained by the farmers of this country under the present administration.

For example, take the matter of low interest rates to farmers for which he gives the credit to the present administration. Let us look at the facts. Here they are: Monday, June 7, 1937, was Consent Calendar day in the House, and on page 5377 of the RECORD for this day I find that bill H. R. 6763 was brought up. This bill provided for the reduction of the interest rate of Federal Land Bank loans to 3½ percent and the rate on Commissioner loans to 4 percent. No objection being raised, the bill was unanimously passed. There is no record of any Republican opposition, nor any other for that matter.

But here comes the "fly in the ointment." On July 12, 1937, I find in the RECORD a message from President Roosevelt, Document No. 290, which is headed "Message from the President of the United States returning without approval H. R. 6763," and so forth. It was ordered to lie on the Speaker's table. In this veto message President Roosevelt said, in part:

The reduction of the rates of interest on Federal land-bank loans to 3½ percent for the fiscal year 1938, and to 4 percent for the fiscal year 1939, as required by the bill for loans made through national farm-loan associations would, it is estimated, necessitate payments from the Treasury in the amount of approximately \$31,700,000 for the former year and \$21,200,000 for the latter, a total of \$52,900,000. The effect of such an arrangement is that part of the individual borrower's interest is paid for him by the United States. In other words, it constitutes a gift to individual borrowers from the Federal Treasury.

The contemplated reduction in interest rates on commissioner loans from 5 to 4 percent under the bill would reduce the annual income of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, which owns those loans, by an amount of approximately \$8,350,000. No provision is made for a corresponding reimbursement of this sum by the Treasury to the Corporation. Losses suffered by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation ultimately fall upon the United States as the sole holder of the Corporation's capital stock. More than this, the payment of principal and interest on all bonds issued by the Corporation is guaranteed by the United States.

Any reduction in the interest rate on commissioner loans will place the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation in such a position that there is a definite possibility that it may not be able to meet its obligations from its own income.

Following up this matter further, I find that on page 7132 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 13, 1937, there were 260 votes to override the President's veto. There were 65 Republicans voting "aye." There were 98 nays, of which only 4 were Republicans. This is conclusive evidence that the Republican votes were necessary for the farmers to obtain the lower interest rates. A few millions off the farmers' backs seemed unthinkable to President Roosevelt.

Still further, I find that on Monday, May 16, 1938, on page 6926 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, H. R. 10530 was unanimously passed. This bill extended for 2 years the 3½-percent interest rate on certain Federal land-bank loans and provided for a 4-percent interest rate on commissioner loans until July 1, 1940.

However, I also find the following message from President Roosevelt, Document No. 713:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 10530, entitled "An act to extend for 2 additional years the 3½-percent interest rate on certain Federal land-bank loans, and to provide for a 4-percent interest rate on land bank commissioner's loans until July 1, 1940."

Section 1 of the bill extends for 2 additional years, beginning July 1, 1938, the 3½-percent interest rate on certain Federal land-bank loans.

Section 2 of the bill extends for approximately 1 year—that is, from July 22, 1939, to June 30, 1940—the 4-percent interest rate on land bank commissioner loans.

Also in the June 15, 1938, RECORD, page 9501, I find the vote to override the President's veto.

Now, just what does this RECORD disclose? First, it shows that 85 Democrats and only 2 Republicans voted to sustain President Roosevelt's veto and against the lower interest rates for farm mortgages. There were 244 votes required to override the President's veto, and the Republican votes were necessary to get a two-thirds majority as 85 Democrats had voted against repassage over the veto. In reading the record of this vote, I was impressed by the large number of new dealers that voted against this lower interest rate for farmers. The new dealers want to take credit for reducing the farm-interest burden but their votes are indisputable evidence that they are making false claims. The unvarnished fact is that the Republicans in Congress, by their votes, made it possible for the farmers to have a 3½-percent to 4-percent interest rate.

#### HERE IS THE RECORD

Mr. FERGUSON says "by their fruits ye shall know them." So may it be.

Below is the record of the roll call on June 15, 1938, page 9051:

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, this is the same type of bill as was vetoed 2 years ago and passed by the House over the President's veto. The same issues and the same provisions are involved. This simply carries forward for another 2 years the rates of interest that have prevailed during the last 2 years. It seems to me the need for the 3½-percent rate on Federal land-bank loans and the 4-percent rate on land bank commissioner's loans is just as great as was the case 2 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Under the Constitution, the vote will have to be taken by the yeas and nays.

The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 244, nays 87, not voting 97, as follows:

[Roll No. 123]

Yeas—244: Aleshire, Allen of Illinois, Allen of Louisiana, Allen of Pennsylvania, Amle, Anderson of Missouri, Andresen of Minnesota,



Arnold, Atkinson, Bacon, Barden, Bates of Massachusetts, Bernard, Biermann, Bigelow, Binderup, Bland, Boileau, Boren, Boykin, Brewster, Brooks, Brown, Buck, Buckler of Minnesota, Burch, Burdick, Cannon of Missouri, Cannon of Wisconsin, Carlson, Carter, Case of South Dakota, Chapman, Church, Clark of North Carolina, Clason, Claypool, Cluett, Coffee of Washington, Collins, Colmer, Cooley, Cooper, Costello, Cox, Cravens, Crawford, Crosser, Crowe, Crowther, Culklin, DeRouen, Dies, Dirksen, Dondero, Dowell, Doxey, Duncan, Dunn, Eckert, Edmiston, Elcher, Elliott, Engel, Englebright, Faddis, Farley, Ferguson, Fish, Flannagan, Fieger, Fletcher, Ford of Mississippi, Fries of Illinois, Fuller, Fulmer, Gamble of New York, Gambrell of Maryland, Garrett, Gearhart, Gehrmann, Gilchrist, Gildea, Goldsborough, Gray of Indiana, Greenwood, Greever, Gregory, Griffith, Guyer, Gwynne, Halleck, Hamilton, Hancock of New York, Harrington, Harter, Havenner, Hill, Hobbs, Holmes, Hope, Houston, Hull, Hunter, Izac, Jacobsen, Jenckes of Indiana, Luther A. Johnson, Lyndon Johnson, Johnson of Minnesota, Johnson of West Virginia, Jones, Kee, Keller, Kerr, Kinzer, Kleberg, Knutson, Kopplemann, Kvale, Lambertson, Larrabee, Lea, Leavy, Long, Lord, Luckey of Nebraska, Ludlow, Luecke of Michigan, McClellan, McFarlane, McGehee, McGrath, McGroarty, McLaughlin, McReynolds, McSweeney, Maas, Mahon of South Carolina, Mahon of Texas, Malone, Mapes, Martin of Colorado, Martin of Massachusetts, Mason, Massingale, Maverick, Mead, Meeks, Michener, Mills, Moser of Pennsylvania, Mott, Mouton, Murdock of Arizona, Nelson, O'Brien of Michigan, O'Connell of Montana, O'Malley, Oliver, Owen, Pace, Parsons, Patman, Patterson, Patton, Pearson, Peterson of Georgia, Pettengill, Phillips, Pierce, Plumley, Poage, Powers, Randolph, Rankin, Reece of Tennessee, Reed of Illinois, Rees of Kansas, Reilly, Rich, Richards, Rigney, Robertson, Robinson of Utah, Robison of Kentucky, Rockefeller, Rogers of Massachusetts, Rogers of Oklahoma, Romjue, Rutherford, Sadowski, Sanders, Satterfield, Sauthoff, Schaefer of Illinois, Schneider of Wisconsin, Schulte, Scott, Seger, Shafer of Michigan, Shannon, Sheppard, Short, Simpson, Smith of Virginia, Snell, Snyder of Pennsylvania, South, Sparkman, Spence, Starnes, Stefan, Summers of Texas, Sutphin, Taber, Taylor of South Carolina, Taylor of Tennessee, Teigan, Terry, Thomas of Texas, Thomas of Texas, Thompson of Illinois, Thurston, Tobey, Transue, Treadway, Turner, Vincent of Kentucky, Voorhis, Wallgren, Warren, Wene, West, Whittington, Wigglesworth, Wilcox, Williams, Withrow, Wolcott, Wolfenden, Wolverton, Woodruff, Zimmerman.

Nays—87: Barry, Beam, Belter, Bloom, Boland of Pennsylvania, Bradley, Buckley of New York, Bulwinkle, Byrne, Celler, Citron, Cochran, Cole of Maryland, Connery, Crosby, Cullen, Daly, Delaney, DeMuth, Dickstein, Dingell, Dixon, Dorsey, Drew of Pennsylvania, Eberhart, Evans, Fitzgerald, Flaherty, Flannery, Forand, Frey of Pennsylvania, Gavan, Gifford, Haines, Harlan, Hart, Healey, Honeyman, Kelly of Illinois, Kelly of New York, Kennedy of Maryland, Kennedy of New York, Keogh, Kocialkowski, Lambeth, Lamneck, Lanzetta, Lewis of Colorado, Lewis of Maryland, Lucas, Luce, McCormack, McGranery, McKeough, Magnuson, Merritt, Mitchell of Illinois, Norton, O'Brien of Illinois, O'Connell of Rhode Island, O'Connor of New York, O'Leary, O'Neal of Kentucky, O'Neill of New Jersey, O'Toole, Palmisano, Patrick, Pfeifer, Polk, Quinn, Ramsay, Ramspeck, Rayburn, Roy, Sabath, Sacks, Shanley, Smith of Connecticut, Smith of West Virginia, Somers of New York, Sullivan, Swope, Tarver, Thom, Umstead, Walter, Woodrum.

Not voting—97: Allen of Delaware, Andrews, Arends, Ashbrook, Barton, Bates of Kentucky, Bell, Boehne, Boyer, Boylan of New York, Caldwell, Cartwright, Casey of Massachusetts, Champion, Chandler, Clark of Idaho, Coffee of Nebraska, Cole of New York, Creal, Cummings, Curley, Deen, Dempsey, Disney, Ditter, Dockweiler, Doughton, Douglas, Drewry of Virginia, Driver, Eaton, Fernandez, Fitzpatrick, Ford of California, Gasque, Gingery, Gray of Pennsylvania, Green, Griswold, Hancock of North Carolina, Hartley, Hendricks, Hennings, Hildebrandt, Hoffman, Hook, Imhoff, Jarman, Jarrett, Jenkins of Ohio, Johnson of Oklahoma, Kirwan, Kitchens, Kniffin, Kramer, Lanham, Lemke, Lesinski, McAndrews, McLean, McMillan, Mansfield, May, Mitchell of Tennessee, Mosier of Ohio, Murdock of Utah, Nichols, O'Connor of Montana, O'Day, Peterson of Florida, Rabaut, Reed of New York, Ryan, Schuetz, Scrugham, Secrest, Sirovich, Smith of Maine, Smith of Oklahoma, Smith of Washington, Stack, Steagall, Sweeney, Taylor of Colorado, Thomas of New Jersey, Tinkham, Tolan, Towey, Vinson of Georgia, Wadsworth, Wearin, Weaver, Welch, Wheelchel, White of Idaho, White of Ohio, Wood.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. Lemke and Mr. Cole of New York (for) with Mr. Hook (against).

Mr. Jenkins of Ohio and Mr. Smith of Washington (for) with Mr. Curley (against).

Mr. Reed of New York and Mr. Hoffman (for) with Mr. O'Connor of Montana (against).

Mr. Eaton and Mr. Ditter (for) with Mr. Boylan of New York (against).

Mr. Arends and Mr. Drewry of Virginia (for) with Mr. Fitzpatrick (against).

Mr. White of Ohio and Mr. Hartley (for) with Mr. Sirovich (against).

This roll call is educational. It shows only 178 Democrats voting to override the President's veto, and for the lower interest rates to the farmers of the Nation.

This roll call also shows 87 votes against overriding the President's veto, of which 85 were Democrats and only 2 Republicans.

The nays on this roll call look like a homecoming of the followers of Tammany Hall, Hague, and Kelly-Nash.

This is no attempt to pit the farmer against any class except the machine politicians of Tammany Hall, Hague, and Kelly-Nash, whose disciples are vociferous in their pleas for the common people, but whose votes are for "cheap" food. If they cannot get it cheap from domestic sources they vote to lower the tariff and get it cheap from foreign sources.

In the same RECORD of Tuesday, July 13, 1937, we find several interesting speeches when the question of overriding the President's veto and giving the farmers of the Nation the benefits of lower interest rates was under consideration.

No. 1. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] wishes to balance the Budget. I was pleased to note that at that time this matter was really considered, as I have not heard anything about this very desirable action since I have been here. I had come to the conclusion that the present administration had held that the balancing of the Budget was but an empty dream.

Mr. RAYBURN. If we are to do this for the farmer, we will be asked to do the same thing for the urban home owner. I think the gentleman will agree with me that the farmer in his country and mine is pretty well out of the depression as far as farm prices are concerned. I think we are selling the produce of our farms at about as reasonable prices as we have had in his time and mine. What argument would we have with reference to the urban home owner should he say he is paying an excessive rate when he is trying to acquire a little home? What argument are we going to make against him if the Committee on Banking and Currency brings out a bill affecting his interest rate? That would cost the Government maybe \$25,000,000, maybe \$50,000,000, or maybe \$100,000,000. I am sure my friend, the gentleman from Texas, knows that I do not ask these questions or make these statements in criticism of him, because I know he has a very hard job, but it is quite possible that all these things added together would increase our annual outlay from \$150,000,000 to \$200,000,000. I think we all realize, I do at least, that it is vitally necessary, and one of the most important things that faces the country, to balance the Budget not later than 1939. [Applause.] We should strive toward that end. I know there are sections of the country in dust and drought which have not in any very great degree recovered, but I believe that the average farmer in this country, the average landowner in this country, with an interest rate reduced 40 percent from what it was if the 4 percent obtained—and I am confident I speak for the vast majority of the farm people of my immediate section in saying this—while he wants a low rate of interest he is willing to pay what it costs the Government with the cost of administration added.

It appears to me that if the President's veto is sustained, that the gentleman from Texas and his committee would in all probability be able to work out something—and we are to be here for some time yet—that would protect the farmer in a lower rate of interest than he has ever had except this 3½ percent, and yet not take money out of the General Treasury.

We also find on page 7124 of the July 13, 1937, RECORD the following speech made by our colleague the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] the ranking Republican member of the Agriculture Committee:

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a few brief observations with respect to some matters which I think should be considered in connection with the President's message.

The President's veto message is predicated upon the idea that the emergency is over as far as the farmers of this country are concerned. It is stated in the message that farm income has increased and that the level of farm prices has increased. This is true; but I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that high farm prices do not do the farmer any good when he has nothing to sell, and that is just the situation in which a large proportion of our farmers have found themselves during the past year. Prices have been good because of drought and crop failures, but the farmer who had nothing to sell got no benefit whatever from that situation. This is the reason, very largely, why a continuing farm emergency is with us. Perhaps in another year, with good crops and good prices, the situation may be different; but for the present the emergency is still with us. If there was reason last year and the year before for giving the Federal land-bank borrowers an interest rate of 3½ percent, that reason prevails to the same extent today.

Later this afternoon the House will act upon the conference report on the farm-tenancy bill. We adopted that legislation for the purpose of doing away with the evils of farm tenancy. We are very foolish, it seems to me, to start a long program of farm-tenancy relief in this country unless we do what we can to prevent the lapse into tenancy which will take place under present conditions unless interest rates are somewhere near what the farmers can pay under existing conditions. During the last 5 years the net increase in the

number of farm tenants in this country has been 200,000, or an average of 40,000 per year. Unless we can stop this drift it is idle to talk about solving the problem of tenancy.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. THURSTON. In regard to the economy phase of the President's veto message, is it the program today that we are to vote upon the proposal to give the President 6 additional secretaries, making a total of 10 secretaries? He already has 4, 2 more than any of his predecessors had. I ask the gentleman also if it is not true that at this time the Federal Government is lending money to shipbuilding concerns for less than 1 percent per annum? The farmer is to pay from 4 to 6 percent.

Did we not just recently provide \$60,000,000 additional out of the Treasury to build more ships, the builders of which will likely receive these low interest rates? These ship concerns also receive subsidies. There are other groups in the country that are being more preferred out of the Federal Treasury in regard to interest rates than the farmers. Therefore other groups are being greatly preferred.

Mr. HOPE. I am in agreement with the gentleman in his contention that there are a great many favors being shown other groups which are being denied the farmer. Furthermore, if the matter of economy is involved, it would take the rest of the afternoon to even enumerate the places where waste and extravagance can be stopped. As long as we can spend over \$500,000,000 a year on the Navy and almost that much on the Army, and can spend over \$1,000,000,000 in 6 months buying gold from all over the world at artificial prices, we can afford to spend a little to ease the interest burden of the farmer.

But right in connection with Government savings let me call attention to the fact that so far as the farmers of this country are concerned we have been doing pretty well in making savings out of the appropriations which the Congress has made for their benefit. Most of you read in the press this morning that \$60,000,000 is to be turned back into the Federal Treasury by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration out of the \$500,000,000 which was appropriated last year for soil-conservation payments. Two years ago we passed a bill making an annual permanent appropriation of one-third of the customs receipts for the benefit of agriculture.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, out of the \$109,000,000 which was made available last year under this appropriation, only \$18,000,000 has been spent. The remainder will eventually go back into the Treasury of the United States.

Mention has been made of the great variation in the interest rates on these Federal land-bank loans. I think something should be done in connection with that. We cannot remedy this general situation at this session of the Congress, but we ought to take the matter up at the next session and work out some permanent plan whereby all farmers will have a uniform rate. We can, however, relieve the existing situation by voting to pass this bill, notwithstanding the veto of the President.

I have the same high regard for the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration and the way in which he has administered the affairs of that organization as the distinguished chairman of our committee. I know that Governor Myers opposes this legislation; but, after all, it is up to the Congress to determine the policy of the Government in this regard. Governor Myers and his associates have carried out the policies that we have heretofore declared in a splendid way. They are entitled to a lot of credit. They will just as cheerfully and as willingly, I am sure, carry out the policy that we declare today, if we override the President's veto.

This speech has the earmarks of being very strong Republican support for the lower interest rate to farmers. Other Republicans, including the gentleman from Kansas, the Honorable EDWARD H. REES, also made a strong speech in support of the lower interest rates.

#### THE PRESENT SESSION

During the present session of Congress, bill H. R. 8748 was introduced to again extend this lower interest rate of 3½ and 4 percent. I offered an amendment to equalize and reduce the interest rate on the commissioner loans to 3½ percent, the same as the interest rate on the Federal land-bank loans, and it was accepted. The House passed the bill providing for 5 years of the lower interest rate, but the Senate reduced this length of time to 2 years, and the House concurred in the Senate's decision. This is election year and Mr. Roosevelt signed the bill; he did not appear to have so many reasons for vetoing it as he had the two previous times. These facts leave no doubt as to the Republican support for farm measures that make common sense.

#### ONE OF MANY EXAMPLES OF NEW DEAL OPERATIONS

On page 7129 of this same RECORD of July 13, 1937, we find a speech by our Republican colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL]. He calls attention to the cross-

purposes of the New Deal agricultural program, whereby President Roosevelt vetoes one bill to lower the interest rate to 3½ to 4 percent and on the same day he has another bill to make 100-percent loans for 40 years at 3 percent interest. This is just one more of the New Deal examples of fake humanitarianism and one more of the alleged social gains we hear so much about. The speech is as follows:

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I do not see how anyone in the face of the facts can justify a vote in support of the President's veto of the bill which continues the present 3½-percent interest rate on Federal farm loans. There is now before the House a conference report accompanying H. R. 7562 and which will undoubtedly be voted upon today. This is a conference report on the farm-tenancy bill, which would loan 100 percent of the value of the farm to tenant farmers to purchase farms with at 3 percent interest. If this bill is carried out to its fullest extent, it will mean that \$11,000,000,000 will be loaned to tenant-farmers of America at 3 percent interest to provide money with which to purchase farms. I am informed that this is an administration measure and that it has the full support of the President. How can the President veto a bill, which veto, if sustained, would compel the farmers to pay the old interest rate and which would discontinue the present interest rate of 3½ percent on farm loans and at the same time support the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, which would ultimately loan to the tenant farmers \$11,000,000,000 at 3 percent interest? To be consistent, the President would, of course, have to veto the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, which is his own administration measure.

I do not want to be misunderstood. I believe the farm-tenant problem is a real problem in America and ought to be solved, but I am simply pointing out the inconsistency of the policy of the President in supporting a bill that will give one class of farmers loans at 3 percent and at the same time vetoing a bill which would give another class of farmers 3½ percent interest on his Federal farm loan. Under the Farm Tenancy Act he is trying to make farm owners out of tenants. In vetoing this interest measure he would be making tenants out of farm owners.

Mr. Speaker, the majority leader in his remarks made a statement that if we continued a 3½-percent interest rate on farm loans, what argument would we have against the reduction of the interest rate on Home Owners' Loan mortgages. The President advanced a similar argument in support of his veto.

On August 17, 1935, and during the first session of the Seventy-fourth Congress (p. 13577) I introduced a bill to reduce the interest rate on home-owners' loans from 5 percent to 3½ percent. At that time I made the following statement on the floor of the House:

"According to a statement furnished me by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, giving the latest available figures, \$2,665,061,750 has so far been borrowed on bonds and loaned to home owners. The rate of interest paid on these bonds varies from 1½ percent to 3 percent per annum, averaging a little more than 2½ percent. The rate charged home owners on mortgages is 5 percent. The Government is charging annually on the above mortgages \$133,244,817 in interest and paying out on these bonds \$70,511,765 annually. In other words, the Government is charging the home owners each year approximately \$63,000,000 more in interest than they are paying out on the bonds."

I also placed in the RECORD a table showing the amount, the serial number, the date of issue, and the interest rate on each home owner's loan bond issued up to June 1, 1935. This verifies the statement I made that the average interest rate paid by the Government was approximately 2½ percent. In view of the fact that the Government is paying 2½ percent and making the home owner pay 5 percent, what justification can the administration have for failing to reduce the interest rate to at least 3½ percent? Why should the home owner pay double the interest rate on the mortgage that the Government is paying on the bonds?

The following article from the September 19, 1940, issue of the Spencer (Wis.) Record, which no doubt was prepared by the New Deal propaganda mill, is a concrete example of the happenings shown in Mr. ENGEL's speech of July 13, 1938:

#### UNIT REORGANIZATION OF FARMS UNDERTAKEN

Big farms to fit land of low production—is building a permanent agriculture in the southern Great Plains, an area attracting nationwide attention in the recent drought years. In these years, the United States Department of Agriculture finds almost without exception, the few farmers able to survive operated farms of 2,000 or more acres, most of which were in grass, with cultivated acres producing supplemental feed.

This pointed the way to unit reorganization, begun last year by the Farm Security Administration. The objective is operating units of 2,000 to 4,000 acres, in contrast to farms of about 500 acres or less, which were common when the land was broken up in the wet years immediately following the World War. Dry years have shown that wheat is not dependable as a major source of income in the western part of the southern plains and have increased absentee ownership. Thousands of acres have been abandoned or returned to the State through tax delinquencies.



The reorganized unit of Fred Bosley in Baca County, Colo., shows how the idea works. In 1935 he had 320 acres. Nearly 2,100 acres could be added to his unit, consisting of 1,060 acres of land to be restored to grass, 90 acres for cultivated crops, and 930 acres of grassland. Negotiations with 8 landowners were necessary before the acreage was acquired. Serious wind erosion had been a menace on land now being restored to native grasses.

Bosley's loan of \$2,000 from the F. S. A. was used to purchase a used tractor and equipment, a herd of 8 dual-purpose cows and 17 range cattle, a pressure cooker for use in the home, for payment of \$236 delinquent taxes and \$95 cash leases, and \$331 for operating expense. His subsistence is provided by sale of produce from the farm. His cash crop is broomcorn. His plan of repayment began with \$200 in May 1939 and is \$300 each spring for the following 6 years.

One hundred and thirty-three reorganizations of the Bosley type have been accomplished since the program was inaugurated last year, the average loan amounting to \$1,740. The average change has been from approximately 600 to 2,500 acres. Approximately 300,000 acres have been brought into better use through this program up to the present time.

About 300 other reorganizations are under way. Although the number of farm families affected is small, the program is new and time is needed to get it in full swing. It is estimated that about 75 percent of the farms in the southern Great Plains must be grouped into larger units if they are to survive.

Here we have a mental picture of the New Deal in action. President Roosevelt had many reasons to veto the reduction of interest rates for the people already on the land but the New Deal took another man, a Mr. Bosley, who had 350 acres and decided he needed 2,100 acres more in his farm. Eight other farmers had to make way for Mr. Bosley. The New Deal had loaned him \$2,000 and started him merrily on his way. Now what has become of the other eight families? Are they in the migratory camps of California? And what about the fatherly help given to one individual and the using of public funds to finance this big-scale program, which is most assuredly operated for the few at the expense of the many? This is not only an example of a lack of common sense but of common justice. How much of this \$270,000,000 of public funds invested in such enterprises will ever be recovered will be an interesting, though painful, observation for the American taxpayer to make?

#### THE NEW DEALERS VOTE TO LOWER THE TARIFF

President Roosevelt promised not to lower the farm tariff when he was elected in 1932. He promoted the Hull brand of reciprocal-trade treaties that lowered the tariff on over 160 farm commodities. When the first treaty was made with Canada and the tariff reduced 2 cents per pound on cheese, there were 14 times as much cheese imported in 1936 as in 1935. In 1938, when cheese averaged 12.6 cents per pound for the year, the second treaty was made and the tariff reduced by another 20 percent. There were  $3\frac{1}{2}$  times as much cheese imported in 1939 as in 1938 even though cheese was only 11.7 cents per pound the first 6 months of 1939.

The following shows the vote on extending these trade treaties as shown on pages 1935-1936 of the February 23, 1940, RECORD:

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 216, nays 168, answered "present" 3, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 31]

Yeas—216: Alexander, Allen of Pennsylvania, Anderson of Missouri, Arnold, Barden, Barnes, Barry, Barton, Bates of Kentucky, Beam, Beckworth, Bell, Bland, Bloom, Boehne, Boland, Boren, Boykin, Bradley of Pennsylvania, Brooks, Brown of Georgia, Bryson, Buck, Bulwinkle, Burch, Burgin, Byrne of New York, Byrns of Tennessee, Byron, Cannon of Missouri, Cartwright, Casey of Massachusetts, Chapman, Clark, Claypool, Cluett, Cochran, Cole of Maryland, Collins, Colmer, Cooley, Cooper, Costello, Courtney, Cox, Cravens, Creal, Crosser, Crowe, Cullen, D'Alesandro, Darden, Davis, Delaney, Dickstein, Dies, Dingell, Doughton, Doxey, Duncan, Dunn, Durham, Eberharter, Edelstein, Ellis, Evans, Faddis, Fay, Ferguson, Fitzpatrick, Flaherty, Flannagan, Flannery, Ford of Mississippi, Thomas F. Ford, Fries, Fulmer, Garrett, Gathings, Gavagan, Geyer of California, Gibbs, Gore, Gossett, Grant of Alabama, Gregory, Griffith, Hare, Harrington, Hart, Harter of Ohio, Hartley, Havenner, Healey, Hennings, Hill, Hobbs, Hook, Houston, Hunter, Izac, Jacobsen, Jarman, Luther A. Johnson, Lyndon Johnson, Johnson of West Virginia, Jones of Texas, Kee, Kefauver, Keller, Martin Kennedy, Kennedy of Maryland, Michael Kennedy, Keogh, Kerr, Kirwan, Kitchens, Kleberg, Kocalkowski, Kramer, Lanham, Larrabee, Lea, Lesinski, Lewis of Colorado, Ludlow, McAndrews, McArdle, McCormack, McGehee, McGranery, McKeough, McLaughlin, Clara G. McMillan, John L.

McMillan, Maciejewski, Mahon, Marcantonio, Martin of Illinois, Massingale, May, Mills of Arkansas, Mills of Louisiana, Mitchell, Monroney, Murdock of Arizona, Murdock of Utah, Myers, Norrell, O'Day, O'Leary, O'Neal, O'Toole, Pace, Parsons, Patman, Patrick, Patton, Pearson, Peterson of Georgia, Pfeifer, Poage, Polk, Rabaut, Ramspeck, Randolph, Rankin, Rayburn, Richards, Robinson of Utah, Rogers of Oklahoma, Romjue, Sabbath, Sacks, Sasser, Satterfield, Schaefer of Illinois, Schuetz, Schwert, Shanley, Shannon, Sheppard, Sheridan, Smith of Connecticut, Smith of Illinois, Smith of Virginia, Smith of West Virginia, Snyder, Somers of New York, South, Sparkman, Spence, Starnes of Alabama, Summers of Texas, Sutphin, Sweeney, Tarver, Tenerowicz, Terry, Thomas of Texas, Thomason, Tolan, Vincent of Kentucky, Vinson of Georgia, Voorhis of California, Ward, Warren, Weaver, Welch, West, Whelchel, Whittington, Williams of Missouri, Wood, Woodrum of Virginia, Zimmerman.

Nays—168: Allen of Illinois, H. Carl Andersen, Andersen of California, A. H. Andresen, Angell, Arends, Austin, Ball, Bates of Massachusetts, Bender, Blackney, Bolles, Bradley of Michigan, Brewster, Brown of Ohio, Buckler of Minnesota, Burdick, Cannon of Florida, Carlson, Carter, Case of South Dakota, Chipfield, Church, Clason, Clevenger, Coffey of Nebraska, Cole of New York, Connerly, Crawford, Culkin, Curtis, Dempsey, Dirksen, Disney, Ditter, Dondro, Douglas, Dworshak, Eaton, Edmiston, Elliott, Elston, Engel, Englebright, Fenton, Fish, Leland M. Ford, Gamble, Gartner, Gearhart, Gerlach, Gifford, Gilchrist, Gillie, Graham, Grant of Indiana, Green, Guyer of Kansas, Gwynne, Edwin A. Hall, Leonard W. Hall, Halleck, Hancock, Harness, Harter of New York, Hawks, Hess, Hinshaw, Hoffman, Holmes, Hope, Horton, Hull, Jenkins of Ohio, Jennings, Jensen, Johns, Johnson of Illinois, Johnson of Indiana, Jones of Ohio, Kean, Keefe, Kilburn, Kilday, Kinzer, Knutson, Kunkel, Lambertson, Landis, Leavy, LeCompte, Lemke, Lewis of Ohio, Luce, McDowell, McLean, McLeod, Maas, Magnuson, Marshall, Martin of Iowa, Martin of Massachusetts, Mason, Michener, Miller, Monkiewicz, Mott, Mundt, Murray, O'Brien, O'Connor, Oliver, Osmer, Peterson of Florida, Pierce, Pittenger, Plumley, Powers, Reece of Tennessee, Reed of Illinois, Reed of New York, Rees of Kansas, Rich, Risk, Rodgers of Pennsylvania, Rogers of Massachusetts, Routzohn, Rutherford, Ryan, Sandager, Schafer of Wisconsin, Schiffer, Scrugham, Seccombe, Secrest, Seger, Shafer of Michigan, Short, Simpson, Smith of Maine, Smith of Ohio, Smith of Washington, Springer, Stearns of New Hampshire, Stefan, Sumner of Illinois, Taber, Talle, Thill, Thorkelson, Tibbott, Tinkham, Treadway, Van Zandt, Vorys of Ohio, Vreeland, Wallgren, Wheat, White of Idaho, White of Ohio, Wigglesworth, Williams of Delaware, Winter, Wolfenden of Pennsylvania, Wolverson of New Jersey, Woodruff of Michigan, and Youngdahl.

Answered "present"—3: Hendricks, Wadsworth, and Wolcott.

Not voting—38: Allen of Louisiana, Andrews, Buckley of New York, Caldwell, Camp, Celler, Coffey of Washington, Corbett, Crowther, Cummings, Darrow, DeRouen, Drewry, Fernandez, Folger, Gehrmann, Jarrett, Jeffries, Jenks of New Hampshire, Johnson of Oklahoma, Kelly, Maloney, Mansfield, Merritt, Moser, Mouton, Nelson, Nichols, Norton, Robertson, Robison of Kentucky, Rockefeller, Schulte, Steagall, Sullivan, Taylor, Thomas of New Jersey, and Walter.

So the joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Merritt (for) with Mr. Jarrett (against).  
Mr. Kelly (for) with Mr. Darrow (against).  
Mr. Nelson (for) with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey (against).  
Mr. Drewry (for) with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire (against).  
Mr. Sullivan (for) with Mr. Caldwell (against).  
Mr. Schulte (for) with Mr. Gehrmann (against).  
Mr. Steagall (for) with Mr. Wolcott (against).  
Mrs. Norton (for) with Mr. Coffey of Washington (against).  
Mr. Mansfield (for) with Mr. Rockefeller (against).  
Mr. Cummings (for) with Mr. Wadsworth (against).  
Mr. Moser (for) with Mr. Hendricks (against).  
Mr. Robertson (for) with Mr. Crowther (against).  
Mr. Maloney (for) with Mr. Corbett (against).  
Mr. DeRouen (for) with Mr. Jeffries (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Taylor with Mr. Andrews.  
Mr. Walter with Mr. Robison of Kentucky.  
Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Folger.  
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Nichols.  
Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Celler.  
Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Mouton.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the announcement of the pairs I ask that my vote in the negative be withdrawn from the record and that I be recorded as voting "present."

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MOSER. If he were present, he would vote "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. STEAGALL. Were he present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." For that reason, I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The interesting fact in connection with this vote is that it gives administration approval to the lower tariff on farm products. Here we not only have recorded the free trade inheritance of the South, but we find the big city cousins from

the lairs of Tammany Hall, Hague, and Kelly-Nash political machines lined up for what they think will be cheaper food. They have many reasons to ask support for their constituents, but they want the farmer to continue to produce in competition with the cheap labor of Europe, Asia, and South America.

These new dealers of the school of Tammany Hall, Hague, Kelly-Nash and company not only voted against lower interest rates for farmers but also for lowered tariffs for the protection of the farmer. They, by their votes, are opposed to the American market for the American farmer, and indirectly their votes harm labor as well.

#### LAGUARDIA IS AGAINST THE FARMER

The new-found friend of the farmer, Mayor LaGuardia, of New York, is to make New Deal speeches during the campaign, according to press reports. I am sure the farmers of the country will be interested to know how he opposed the tariff increase on their products when he was a Member of Congress.

In the Friday, May 24, 1929, RECORD, on pages 1885 and 1886, Mr. LaGuardia, along with Mr. Ramseyer, of Iowa, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], who were in favor of a 14-cent tariff on butter, spoke as follows:

MR. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this is an amendment to increase by 2 cents the rates on butter and butter substitutes. The bill as originally prepared by the committee fixed the rate on butter at 12 cents and the related products, milk, cream, and so forth, on that basis.

The butter rate was fixed on a cost study between the United States and Denmark, and the 12 cents represents an increase from 8 cents to 12 cents, which was made by the President April 5, 1928.

After the bill was reported—in fact, during the hearings held during the past week by the Republican members of the committee, and before which appeared both Republican and Democratic Members of the House, this is one of the subjects that was brought up—and the claim was made that the rate was too low.

I personally took this matter up with the Tariff Commission, and there found some cost studies that they had on the production of butter in Canada and in the United States, and also between New Zealand and the United States.

The cost studies made by the Tariff Commission a few years ago between this country and Denmark showed a difference of 12.92 cents per pound.

The President increased the duty to the limit—that is, 50 percent—which raised it from 8 cents to 12 cents.

In the Tariff Commission there is a report on butter obtained from a special report of the Canadian House of Commons showing the cost of producing butter in Ontario. Based on this report, the cost difference between Canada and this country is 13.25 cents per pound.

Then we have two reports in possession of the Tariff Commission on the costs in New Zealand, one is from the Wisconsin Experiment Station, which was conducted in New Zealand by Dean Russell and Professor Macklin, men who have the confidence of members of the Tariff Commission. Upon this study it is shown that the cost of producing butter in New Zealand is 27.9 percent less than in Denmark.

At the time the butter study was made by the Tariff Commission of the United States, a gentleman by the name of Mr. S. Sorenson, of Denmark, was here and testified as an expert before the Commission on the cost of producing butter in Denmark. From here he went to New Zealand and conducted a cost study on producing butter in New Zealand. Mr. Sorenson's report shows that the cost of producing butter in New Zealand is 25 percent less than in Denmark. Remember, now, that the 12 cents we have now on butter is based on the cost difference between Denmark and the United States.

This report from the Wisconsin Experiment Station and the report made by Mr. Sorenson, of Denmark, one found that the cost of producing butter was 27.9 percent less in New Zealand than in Denmark, and the other found 25 percent less in New Zealand than in Denmark, are almost together. On this basis the difference in producing a pound of butter in New Zealand and the United States is about 19 cents per pound.

The committee therefore determined to recommend to the House an increase from 12 cents to 14 cents.

THE CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired. MR. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes more.

THE CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

MR. RAMSEYER. This 14 cents equalizes the difference in cost between the United States and Canada. If the New Zealand competition should become injurious, the Tariff Commission, having power to increase or decrease 50 percent, could take care of that situation.

The committee does not recommend a change in any of the rates in the related paragraphs to butter.

On milk we increased the duty from 2½ cents to 5 cents a gallon. This is on the basis of 12 cents on butter, and the cream we increased from 20 cents to 48 cents per gallon.

The question may arise, if we increase butter from 12 cents to 14 cents, why should we not increase the other products in the milk paragraphs? Since the hearings before the committee closed the Tariff Commission made a report to the President as to the differences in the costs of producing milk and cream in the United States and in Canada, and this report shows that the cost difference in milk amounts to 4.3 cents per gallon. The rate in the bill is 5 cents a gallon.

The difference in cost of producing cream in the United States and in Canada is 41.2 cents per gallon, and the rate in the bill is 48 cents a gallon. On the basis of the differences in costs of producing milk and cream, no changes are necessary in the proposed rates in the bill.

MR. KETCHAM. Before the gentleman leaves that point, will he yield for one question?

MR. RAMSEYER. Yes.

MR. KETCHAM. Referring to New Zealand and their production cost of butter, is it not also necessary that we have a differential higher than the one against Canada for the simple reason that they produce their surplus at the very time when our production costs are the highest?

MR. RAMSEYER. Their winter comes during our summer, and vice versa.

MR. KETCHAM. And, consequently, their costs are lowest when our costs are highest.

MR. RAMSEYER. Yes; and the committee is of the opinion that this 14 cents will take care of that situation.

MR. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman explain to the members of the committee why it is that the committee in its wisdom is not recommending to the House an additional tariff on the product of dried whole milk in view of the raise in the rates on butter?

MR. RAMSEYER. When you take into consideration that this late report of the Tariff Commission shows the differences in the costs of producing milk and cream in the United States and in Canada are less than the rates in the bill on milk and cream, and although we have not the difference in cost of production of dried milk, if such a study were made, it would probably be found that the rates in the bill are high enough to equalize the cost difference in this country and Canada.

MR. WOODRUFF. What I had in mind was not the difference in cost between this country and Canada but the condition that exists in the importation from Scandinavian countries. They are importing thousands of tons of dried milk, and it seems to me that this is an opportune time for the Ways and Means Committee to recognize the situation.

MR. RAMSEYER. The proposed rates in the bill on dried milk represents a considerable increase over the existing law and should take care of the situation the gentleman has in mind.

THE CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

MR. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment. Mr. Chairman, after the Committee on Ways and Means had given this matter a great deal of study they reported the bill leaving butter at 12 cents a pound. This was no mere accident, it was the result of very careful study, and there was considerable data available, because the Tariff Commission had made a study of butter conditions, and the rate was increased from 8 cents to 12 cents not very long ago. Under the 12-cent rate the importation of Danish butter practically stopped. Figures will bear me out on that.

It is true that New Zealand is producing butter, but New Zealand is not exporting any great amount of butter to the United States. You will find a very heavy exportation of butter from New Zealand to the Philippines, and the greater part of that butter is consumed by the United States Army in the Philippines.

If you want to cut off the New Zealand market you can do so by writing into the appropriation bill for the Army that all food for the Army in the Philippines shall be purchased in the United States. It would not be necessary to write that into the appropriation bill if the 15 States which represent agriculture would go to the Quartermaster General and point out that the United States Army in the Philippines is consuming New Zealand butter. By doing that they might bring about the desired result.

But I submit that there is no justification for an increase of duty from 12 to 14 cents on butter, because there is very little butter being imported. Butter is so expensive now that it is a luxury. Much has been said about the producer, the industrial worker, and the farmer, but let me say to you that if you run the price up so high that the consumers are not able to purchase butter it will not do any good.

MR. BURTNESS. Does the gentleman wish to eat foreign butter instead of domestic butter?

At the time Mayor LaGuardia was protesting about the high cost of living in his district the racketeers were in control. It cost more at that time to transport a carload of poultry four blocks from the terminal to the killing pens in New York City than it cost in freight from Wisconsin to New York City.

The New Deal with all its trimmings here caused a greater spread between what the producer gets and what the consumer pays. To help both the producer and the consumer



this spread should be narrowed instead of constantly widened as it is by the New Deal.

The following remarks in the RECORD of May 24, 1929, by our colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] shows that even then he was looking after the interests of the dairy farmers of this Nation; and we all know he has been trying to do so ever since but without much success under the New Deal:

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the committee amendment. I was under the impression that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGuardia] was for the farmers, but hearing his talk here this afternoon on the question of the increase of 2 cents a pound in the rate on butter, it seems to me that he has deserted the farmers of this country. He referred to 15 States that are involved in the matter of this question of butter. Why, every farmer in the United States who has a dairy cow will be benefited by this increase in the tariff. It is not a sectional proposition; it is a national proposition, and it is the only agricultural tariff where all of the farmers in the country will be benefited, and we are asking for this increase from 12 to 14 cents for that reason.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The gentleman does not want the 19 cents?

Mr. ANDRESEN. Further, the gentleman states that the Tariff Commission recommended certain changes in the tariff on butter, based on an investigation some years ago. At that time, in 1924, Denmark was the principal competing country, and the Tariff Commission naturally took the principal competing country and the conditions they found there, but the situation has changed since then and New Zealand today is the principal competing country, and the difference in the cost of production there and here is 18 cents per pound, less transportation. The farmers are entitled to have 15 cents on butter, but they will be satisfied with the 14 cents at the present time and then appear before the Tariff Commission for further increase when conditions demand it.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The gentleman, then, is supporting the committee amendment and not the amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. ANDRESEN. I rose in support of the committee amendment.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. That is some relief.

Mr. ANDRESEN. As far as raising the cost to the consumers of butter is concerned, I say to the Members of the House that they need have no fear as to a rise in the price of butter on account of this increase in the tariff, for the reason that the farmers are not today receiving the full benefit of the 12-cent tariff.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

#### SPEECH FROM NEW JERSEY

The following speech by Mrs. NORTON, of New Jersey, is in this same May 24, 1929 issue, page 1881. This speech is against raising the tariff on cattle. It is well to note here that ever since the Democratic administration of 1912 the United States has been on a beef-importing basis. The production of pork in the United States is gradually equaling the domestic consumption, and no doubt if the New Deal stays in power, we will soon be on a pork importing basis, whereas, a few years ago we were large exporters of pork and pork products.

The speech is as follows:

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

This tariff was supposed to be revised principally to aid the farmer; that we all admit; but the tariff placed on imported beef and lamb is outrageous.

It is admitted by all the packers in Chicago that, as a result of decreased production during the last 5 years, beef has increased to the point that it cannot be sold to the masses, and there is no profit for the distributor. This is conceded by Wilson, Armour, Swift, and Cudahy in their reports; and their remarks can be found in the tariff hearings, volume 7, schedule 7, page 3947, fresh meats.

I would also like to refer to Mr. Alfred H. Benjamin's brief on page 3951, containing important statistics dealing with the cattle in this country, showing there was a decrease of 1,800,000 cattle during the last 5 years; but, notwithstanding that decrease, the cattle on hand had increased to the extent of \$500,000,000. The figures quoted in the brief referred to were taken from the Yearbook of the Department of Commerce, 1928, volume 1, table 70, page 246, which shows a big increase in livestock prices in 1927.

Think of it! We now pay \$1 for four lamb chops, and the price of steak is beyond reach of the workingman's dining table.

I am told it takes 5 years, at least, to produce cattle. If we increase the tariff at this time, every family in this country will be taxed for the next 3 years from \$1,000 to \$1,500 per annum over and above the present high cost of living.

The vital necessities of life, and particularly for the Nation, are meat, butter, milk, cream, and sugar, and all of these commodities call for an increase of 100 percent under this new tariff.

During the past year, with the prevailing high prices on all meat products, it has been difficult for the average wage earner to purchase meats. The meat consumption has not declined in localities where people have money enough to buy it; but it is a pitiful sight in a meat market to find women who formerly were able to buy enough meat to properly feed a family, picking around from item to item and then having sufficient money to buy meat for only half the family.

This is true of your Government employees, living on a starving wage, right here in the Capital City. I know many who have tried to budget, and found these economic experts failed to give the true prices on foodstuffs, in order to arrive at certain conclusions.

The small amount of foreign meat products imported helps reduce the cost for those who badly need it, and the so-called chain stores have been a godsend to the working class, which is the backbone of the Nation.

To place an embargo on this food product will put the domestic meat at such a value that it will curtail consumption and destroy the object for which it was intended.

The President of the United States, in his message to Congress, said:

"I have called this special session of Congress to redeem two pledges given in the last election—farm relief and limited changes in the tariff."

We have been in session more than 5 weeks. Nothing has been accomplished of benefit to the farmer to date.

It has often been said that the power to tax is also the power to destroy. We all believe in a protective tariff—we must, to save our own industries, whether we come from north, south, east, or west. However, the building up of a high wall of tariff around the things that the people of the United States must buy is serious and will limit the amount of things that they would like to buy. Tariff should be written without any sectional interest.

I have tried to be fair and study both sides of the argument and digest some of the reports of the hearings before the committee. Many will acknowledge it to be a rather difficult task, and I am talking simply from the standpoint of the housewife, or the "consumer," so often referred to in this debate.

I cannot, in all fairness, see any logic in the proposed tax on sugar. It seems to me we are placing this heavy duty on the people of the United States to save a few acres of land in certain States where they raise sugar beets and employ Mexican labor and women and children, violating all our labor laws.

Some ambitious gentlemen are trying to foster an industry here and reclaim land at the expense of the American people. If this bill becomes a law, I am informed this Republican Congress will place a charge on the people of the United States on this one item alone of \$240,000,000 a year.

Why should we make the consumer bear the cost of foreign labor on sugar-beet industry in the United States when we can get it so cheaply from our island possessions? Sugar is one of our most valued products. It is necessary to life. Why destroy our Territories by placing such a tariff on sugar? It is not economic, not sound. It is not the beet grower that will be benefited by this vicious increase but the beet-sugar manufacturer; the dirt farmer never seems to get anything, because it is not the tiller of the soil who is considered but the manufacturer, always. It is the manufacturer who contributes to the campaign; therefore he receives his reward in tariff, a despicable custom, but true.

I also protest against hides being taken off the free list. It will not benefit the farmer but only increase his cost of living, for he will be bound to pay more money for his boots and shoes. We all pay enough now. Only the large packers would be favored by placing a tariff on hides.

I am willing to protect the boot and shoe industry by placing a duty on shoes and finished leather to offset the foreign competition, especially in women's fancy shoes; but I am not in favor of taking hides off the free list. What this industry needs is free raw material and protection for its products. The domestic supply of hides is decreasing and importations are increasing rapidly.

I am not an alarmist, but I see in this situation of unnecessarily burdening our people a far greater cause of dissatisfaction than in anything that has ever happened and a big step forward to encourage "red" sentiment in this country.

Then, too, raising a high tariff wall certainly is not a step toward world peace. We talk about peace. We spend millions and millions of the taxpayers' money to build new implements of war to insure peace and protect our shores, while we neglect the greatest implement of peace in all the world, "brotherly love."

We call ourselves "allies," yet raise a barrier wall of tariff so high that it is equivalent to serving notice on the nations of the world that we do not want their goods, even at the loss of their friendship.

We are so well satisfied with ourselves we prefer to live alone. Of course, we will magnanimously sell to them; but we do not want to buy from them. And the worst part of it is that we pretend it is because we would help the working people of our country and keep them employed; when, as a matter of fact, for every extra dollar the working man or woman is paid in wages they spend a dollar and a half in food and clothing to make up for that extra dollar.

What a sham! What hypocrisy! How long do you think it will take the working men and women of the Nation to wake up? Do you not think they know who really gets the extra dollar?

Certainly not the dirt farmer whom you are pretending to assist. He is usually a pretty wise man, says little but thinks much; and while I confess he did not show much wisdom in the last election, he will have 4 years more to realize his mistake, and maybe we will have better luck next time.

If I were not thinking of the already overburdened housewife and her undernourished children, I would encourage you to build a higher tariff wall, realizing that it would be so much easier for my party to be returned in 1930; but not even to realize this ambi-

tion would I hesitate to plead with you to think twice before you place a greater burden on our people and prevent our children from getting the food they require to build their bodies.

Members of Congress have lost much of the respect that was and should be rightfully ours. We do work hard; many of us think straight; and, therefore, we should not allow a group of reactionary Republican leaders, working in the interest of powerful corporations, to lead us away from the service we solemnly swore to render to all the people of our country. Such procedure is not only dangerous from a party point of view but it is inhuman and endangers the lives of the people we have sworn to protect.

Since I came to Congress many fine men have passed to the great beyond. When they came to the judgment seat to render an account of their stewardship, which service do you think counted in their favor? Their service to humanity or their service to the Power Trusts and overlords of the business world?

The higher tariff on foodstuffs is indefensible. To satisfy the greed of a minority, it will work great hardship on the majority; and I cannot believe that any Member of Congress will deliberately do this great injustice to the already discouraged poor people of the country.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Beck, in his brilliant speech on Wednesday sounded a note of warning, which I hope will be considered by even the superprotectionists.

President Hoover started his journey to the White House through feeding the starving children of Europe. He was supported then by a great leader—President Wilson.

I sincerely hope his journey away from the White House may not begin through neglect of the children of his own country.

Let him show his leadership now and prove to all the people of the country that he is big enough for the great position he was elected to fill. [Applause.]

It is well to note that in 1932 Mr. Roosevelt knew of no tariffs that were too high. He has reduced the tariffs and caused great increases in beef importation. If the Smoot-Hawley tariff is so unfair why does not the New Deal repeal it? They talked against it before passage, but they still keep it on the statutes.

This LaGuardia attitude is the attitude of Tammany Hall, Hague, and Kelly-Nash and company. Legislation for the few, and give us cheap food—either domestic or from cheap foreign sources. This spirit is among this group in the present Congress as they vote in a body to support lower farm tariffs.

With the huge imports of cattle and meats under the New Deal these big-city friends should be happy, and if the Argentine treaty can be effected after the elections on November 5, mirth should go unrestrained in the bailiwicks of Tammany, Hague, and Kelly-Nash.

#### THE NEW DEAL QUOTATION AND THE ANSWER

Why anyone should brag about running the country in debt \$3,000,000,000 a year for 7 years is beyond my reasoning, but this is what the New Dealers do.

While the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERGUSON] quotes the Bible, saying: "Wherefore by their fruits we shall know them" in reference to the Republicans' attitude, I wish to say that he should carefully consider two other Biblical passages, one of which is: "What does a man profiteth if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" and the warning, "Visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation."

In regard to the first quotation, it is well to call the attention of the farmers to the fact that they must not be misled by empty promises. The new dealers should tell the farmers that there is nothing left in the United States Treasury to promise as they have spent it and that the third and fourth generations will be paying for what has already been spent and wasted by the New Deal.

In regard to the second quotation, the farmers will not be deceived for long into thinking they can get subsidies of borrowed money because they will lose their own soul in becoming tools of the New Deal and the whole house will fall, due to the increased public debt. No one can deny that New Deal subsidies are nothing but money borrowed by the New Deal and given out to the people that furnish the money. The new dealers may say they are robbing Peter to pay Paul, but in fact the New Deal robs both Peter and Paul.

#### THE FACTS MR. FERGUSON AND OTHER NEW DEALERS WILL NOT TELL THE FARMERS

(1) The new dealers will not tell the people that they drove 91,195 farmers from their homes because they could not pay \$112 interest on an average \$2,800 loan; and during

the same time, under the U. S. H. A., they built 90,436 housing units costing \$4,350 a unit, and pay an average of \$193 per unit of the rent each year for 60 years. These U. S. H. A. units cost \$28,000,000 a year subsidy for 60 years, or a total of \$1,680,000,000.

In other words, the New Deal drove more people from their farm homes than new homes were provided by the New Deal, and the public debt was increased by \$1,680,000,000. This is fake humanitarianism and a false social gain.

(2) The new dealers will not tell the people about the \$2,800,000 worth of fluid milk that was purchased in the Boston area, the only city in the United States.

(3) The new dealers will not tell the people about the \$1,000,000 worth of fish purchased with Federal Surplus Commodity funds, when many agricultural products were bringing 50 percent of the cost of production. The new dealers thought they controlled the food produced on the land and wanted to start controlling the fish in the seven seas.

(4) The new dealers will not explain in detail the fake parity-payment program. They will not tell the farmers of the country, as a whole, that up to January 1, 1940, cotton farmers alone have had 69 percent of this so-called parity money. They will not reveal the fact that one State, Texas, received 27 percent of the parity money in 1 year. They will not reveal that the New England States did not receive a dollar of the so-called parity money. They will not reveal that some States averaged no payment per farm per year while other States averaged \$80 to \$86 payment per farm per year. This procedure is not based on common sense nor is it based on common justice. They will not tell the farmers that this money is still a part of the public debt and must be repaid with interest. They will not reveal that they refused to make milk a basic commodity, so other farmers could be included.

(5) The new dealers will not tell the farmers that, while they have been receiving \$3,000,000,000 in subsidies, which is borrowed money, the farmers' share of the public debt has risen over \$6,000,000,000. They will not tell that, while the farmer, on the basis of total farms in the United States has obtained a subsidy of \$48 per farm per year for 6 years, or \$288 per farm average for the 6 years, the increased public debt has increased so much that there is an invisible mortgage of \$1,000 placed on every farm in America by the New Deal. The subsidy to capital in tax-exempt bonds amounts to thousands of dollars a year, but to the few.

(6) The new dealers will not reveal that the lower farm prices obtained under the New Deal cause a loss of many times more money than the subsidies of borrowed money obtained by them through the New Deal. They will not tell of the 50-cent wheat, and 5-cent lard, and 10-cent cotton under the New Deal.

(7) They will not tell the farmers who have Federal farm mortgages on their farms that President Roosevelt twice vetoed the 3½- to 4-percent interest-rate reduction for farmers while at the same time the New Deal was appropriating millions of dollars to make farm owners out of non farm owners and giving them 40-year mortgages at only 3-percent interest. They will not tell the people that in 1940—election year—that the President did not veto the lower interest rates. This is a striking example of fake humanitarianism and one of the alleged social gains. The new dealers will not tell the public about the hundreds of Communists, and the foreign collectivist sympathizers on the United States pay roll, including the Agricultural Department.

(8) They will not tell the farmers of this country that the New Deal agricultural program is not based on common sense. They will not tell anyone that this program has caused many farmers to operate on a large scale in order to get the Federal subsidies and has driven tenants by the thousands on to the relief rolls and into migratory camps.

(9) They will not tell the public that this agricultural program was put into operation under the guise of soil conservation while its activities are becoming more and more centered on New Deal conservation.

(10) The new dealers will not tell the public that, though \$500,000,000 may be appropriated annually under the guise of



soil conservation, the actual facts are that the most fertile and productive farm in America can be depleted in its fertility and still have the operator obtain New Deal subsidy checks of borrowed money.

(11) The new dealers will not tell the public that, after criticizing one government for bartering and subsidizing foreign trade, they turned around and paid an export bounty of 25 cents per bushel on wheat and \$7.50 a bale on cotton in an effort to show increased agricultural exports.

(12) The new dealers will call no one's attention to the fact that subsidy checks vary from \$7 to \$9 per farm per year on a total farm basis in some States while in other border States they have averaged \$150 to \$175 per farm per year. They will not call your attention to the fact that the fake parity checks amount to nothing at all in a half dozen States, \$1 to \$2 per year in other States and over \$85 in still other States, with no plausible reason for this allocation.

(13) The new dealers will not call your attention to the large subsidy checks of \$257,000 issued to one insurance company in 1 year on its farms when the average county in the United States received about \$150,000 for all its farmers. They will not tell you that while the average farm would be entitled to but \$48 per farm per year, one large corporation farm received \$112,000 in 1938 and \$122,000 in 1939. They will not call your attention to the fact that one State received one-eighth of all the agricultural subsidies.

(14) The new dealers will not call your attention to the fact that on January 1, 1933, the average Federal land bank loan was \$2,254 while on April 1, 1940, it was \$3,062.

(15) They will not tell the people of the thousands of foreclosures on Federal farm loans. They will not tell you that in Wisconsin, in 1939, a higher percentage of loans and a larger number of loans were foreclosed and acquired than ever before in the history of the Federal land bank.

(16) They will not tell the public of the cross-purpose schemes of the New Deal. They will not tell of the \$500,000,000 annual appropriation to control agricultural production; the appropriated millions to increase agricultural production, and the appropriated millions for export bounties to get rid of the surpluses which they appropriated public money to create.

(17) They will not tell the story of how the New Deal land and farm policy drove thousands upon thousands of farmers off their farms onto the relief rolls and into migratory camps at great expense to the public.

(18) They will not tell the public how they drove the farmers from their farms, appropriated money for the migratory camps, appropriated more money for the Civil Liberty Committee to go and call on the camps and bask in the California sunshine and then turned around and appropriated more money for a new joint committee to evidently find out why the farmers ever left their farms in the first place.

(19) They will not openly tell the cotton farmers that the New Deal has really bungled his business so that he has lost a large share of the world's cotton market for all time to come. For all these subsidies that represent a third of the assessed valuation of the farms, many of these Southern States have 35 percent delinquent land bank commissioner loans and some States, like Mississippi have 48 percent delinquent commissioner farm loans.

(20) The New Deal will never be able to explain how they can, in justice, follow a scheme to loan one man 57 cents per bushel on his corn and then loan none to the rest of the corn farmers of this country. This is most assuredly legislation for the few at the expense of the many. We must have legislation for all and not for the few. I believe in making loans in order to put a bottom under farm prices, but it should be for all farmers, and not for the few.

(21) The New Deal will not tell the dairy farmers that cheese was 17.5 cents per pound the 7 years before the New Deal, 14.7 cents per pound the last 4 Republican years, 13.2 cents per pound the first 7 New Deal years, and in 1938 was only 12.6 cents per pound, and in 1939 only 12.8 cents per pound. They will not tell them that the New Deal reduced

the tariff on cheese 42 percent. They will not tell them that on January 1, 1936, when the tariff was reduced 2 cents per pound, the price of cheese immediately dropped 2 cents per pound, and that 14 times more cheese was imported in 1936 than in 1935. They will not tell you that, according to Bulletin 201, United States Department of Agriculture, pages 33-41, that the average price of butter on farms was 35 cents the 6 pre-New Deal years and only 26 cents the first 6 years of the New Deal; and in 1939, after 6 years of the New Deal, it was only 25.8 cents per pound.

(22) The New Deal will not tell the people that in 1932 President Roosevelt said that he knew of no tariffs that were too high. The New Deal will not tell the people that the New Deal immediately began reducing the tariff on over a hundred and sixty farm products.

(23) The new dealers will recite the sins of the Smoot-Hawley tariff, but they will not explain to the people of this country why they do not repeal the act.

(24) The new dealers will vociferously defend the reciprocal-trade treaties, whereby the power is delegated to one man to control the milk check of every dairyman in America.

(25) They will not call your attention to the fact that the new dealers themselves could not stomach the delegation of power to the bureaucrats in the Government, so the lawyers effected passage of the Walter-Logan bill in the House this session. This bill gives a court review of New Deal bureaucratic decisions. However, they think that the farmer should like to have the control of his milk check delegated to one man. They will not bring Thomas Jefferson in on this one.

(26) The New Deal Members from the vicinity of the milksheds will not try to explain why they want a domestic tariff, putting up a Chinese wall in order to keep the local fluid milk market for their farmers and will then vote to justify a tariff reduction on the manufactured dairy products, putting these farmers in competition with the cheap labor of South America, Europe, and Asia.

(27) The new dealers will not tell how they had a booklet, one-half inch thick, printed, telling about the sins of interstate trade barriers and then turned around and erected trade barriers in the milksheds of the country. The New Deal fixes prices for the few but opposes price fixing for the many. They "blow hot" and "blow cold."

(28) The new dealers like the protection of a tariff when they can benefit from it. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERGUSON] and a dozen other new dealers were much opposed to the Argentine treaty last year and protested against any reduction in the tariff on their products and even went so far as to oppose the tariff on turkeys; then turned around and gave their stamp of approval to the 42-percent reduction in the tariff on cheese. The Smoot-Hawley tariff seems to be agreeable to them when they can benefit from it, but they want the loss to be sustained by other groups.

The new dealers can hardly wait for election day to take up another trade treaty with the Argentine.

(29) The new dealers will not tell the people about the 750,000 head of cattle imported in 1939. They will not tell about the small agricultural exports that have resulted from the New Deal program, the lowest in the history of the country.

(30) New dealers may use the new-found friend of the farmers, LaGuardia, to gather votes, but there is one outstanding fact and that is that in past sessions the Representatives from the boss-ridden cities like Tammany, Hague, Kelly-Nash, and company are more interested in cheap food than any other part of agricultural procedure.

This is shown in the present Congress. Take Chicago, located in the greatest agricultural area in the land, sends Representatives here that vote for lower tariffs and against lower interest rates for farmers.

Chicago, the world's greatest livestock market, is doing well to maintain its lead. These yard people should realize what it means to the yards and to the labor of Chicago if cheap foreign meats are to be imported from the Argentine in such great amounts. They should also realize what these cheap

imports will mean to the surrounding rural area. The Representatives from this livestock business district should be fair enough minded to see what these low tariffs mean to the life of this great livestock center, as well as the farmers of this territory, and not be voting against lower interest rates for farmers and for lower tariffs, as they do vote.

(31) The new dealers will not tell the farmers of the country that they were able to exclude agricultural products from the provisions of the interstate traffic of convict-made goods. Our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], made every effort to give the farmer the benefits that other groups obtained from this legislation, but to no avail.

(32) The new dealers praise the stamp plan. They like the red and blue stamps. There are 2,240 foster homes with an enrollment of 242,000 children that could be supplied with food if the new dealers wished to provide for this non-voting group. The only fly in the ointment about this program is that the farmer has to carry the burden. The New Deal fixes prices for some small groups of farmers, but turns around and buys the wares of the majority of farmers that have a surplus on bids, and as cheaply as they can, and gives it away to the farmer's customer to sit down and eat. The farmers of this country have for 10 years furnished 25 percent to 35 percent of the cost of feeding the Nation, and this includes the rich as well as the poor. The farmers should not be further impoverished in order to carry out any New Deal schemes. We should have a program with a little more of the red, white, and blue, and not only the red and blue. The farmer cannot be expected to feed the Nation at a loss indefinitely.

(33) The Department of Agriculture has become a New Deal propaganda mill. There was a time when their writings were academic and nonpolitical.

(34) The New Deal has loaded the top offices of the Department of Agriculture with political agriculturists that have never had agricultural training. This has been done in the face of the fact that agricultural colleges have been turning out graduates for over 50 years. Thousands of Smith-Hughes agricultural teachers are in our land.

(35) We must forget the visionary New Deal schemes, and inaugurate the philosophy of the McNary-Haugen bill, and give all farmers an equal opportunity.

(36) No; the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERGUSON] does not need to worry about what will happen to the farm people of this Nation if and when the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., is in the Speaker's chair.

Every Member of this House knows that Mr. MARTIN is one of the fairest-minded men here, and that agricultural groups, as well as all groups, will have equal, fair, and honest consideration from this outstanding American. No one dares, nor will, deny this assertion.

The danger will come from listening to the bedtime stories of your New Deal professional politician and political agriculturist that will ruin this country if they continue their wasteful, extravagant, cross-purpose, collectivist schemes that are based on neither common sense nor on common justice. Mr. Speaker, the fact is, I do not think much of the New Deal and no one else would if they took time to decipher it. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

#### CONGRESS SHOULD NOT ADJOURN

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, early in June, when there was considerable discussion that the Congress should adjourn, I felt that it would be a serious mistake under existing world conditions to do so. It will be recalled that the President at that time, at two separate press conferences, stated that there was no necessity for the Congress remaining in session. I believe it will be admitted by all now that it would have been a grievous mistake to have adjourned at that time.

Since that time the greater portion of the legislation which is necessary for national defense has been passed by the Con-

gress, including appropriations and authorizations for a two-ocean navy, as well as a total authorization and appropriation of something over \$15,000,000,000 to round out the defense program.

In addition, we have enacted legislation authorizing the calling of the National Guard and the law providing for national training and conscription in order to make possible an army of 1,200,000. We have now practically completed this program insofar as authorization and needed funds are concerned.

However, the Congress is the body representing the people of America that is charged with the responsibility of keeping this country out of war. I believe that, if for no other reason, the Congress should remain in session continuously as long as the world crisis continues and keep guard at our gates against war. Much may happen within a day or a week or a month that may change the whole program having to do with our national defense. If Congress adjourns we cannot reconvene. Only the President can call us back. The greatest security we can have against possible involvement in the foreign war is keeping the Congress on the job. Aside, however, from these reasons, important as they are, the domestic problems confronting the Nation cannot be ignored. We must admit that the first line of defense is a sound economic and financial economy. This we do not have. Our credit is being strained to the breaking point. Our tax structure is wholly inadequate to take care of our ordinary continuing expenses, let alone the huge increased preparedness expense we have now authorized. We still have over 9,000,000 unemployed, and our industrial enterprises are hard pressed. In a word, our whole economic and financial structure needs overhauling. Congress must find solutions to these questions if America is to survive.

Mr. Speaker, there is an additional problem that we should now begin to consider, and that is our economic recovery after the war and threat of war ends. Some day the great catastrophe in Europe will be over. Some day we will be no longer confronted with the specter of war in the offing. Some day we will return to a peace status. When demobilization takes place, the transition from a war basis to peacetime activities will strain our economic and financial structure almost to the breaking point. Millions of men will be thrown out of our fighting forces and our wartime industries, and no positions will be open for them. When that day arrives, as it will arrive, we will be confronted with a "war" within our own borders—another war against unemployment, closed factories, idle men, and idle money. We will be confronted with a public debt which may reach seventy-five billions and a tax burden that will be difficult to carry. We must begin now to work out a solution to this catastrophe that will confront us and may again throw this country into a worse depression than that we have confronted for the last 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, in view of these considerations, I urge the Congress to remain in session and not merely mark time but devote itself to a solution of these momentous questions confronting us.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CLAYPOOL for 2 weeks on account of important business.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution which reads as follows:

Whereas if it be necessary for the national defense of the United States for all possible aid to be given to the Government of Great Britain short of war: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that if and when the Chief Executive and Secretary of State contemplate any agreement with the Government of England for the transfer to that government of any military or naval equipment and essential supplies in exchange for other property as a gift or by lease or as an outright gift to said government, the Congress ought to be advised*



thereof in advance of the consideration of such arrangement in order that the Congress may have opportunity to exercise its constitutional prerogative to authorize and approve or disapprove the same.

It seems, Mr. Speaker, that this is a very wise provision, one that will meet the approval of the Congress and will be welcomed with relief and joy all over the country. The people of America are greatly alarmed regarding the international situation as it affects us and they want everything done in their own defense. They certainly want nothing done that will weaken it—as proof of that, witness the unanimous demand from persons all over the United States demanding that the Congress stay in continuous session.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2524. An act to incorporate the Military Order of the Purple Heart.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 30, 1940, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 10572. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2983). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts: House Resolution 616. Resolution to authorize the payment of expenses of investigation authorized by House Resolution 321; without amendment (Rept. No. 2984). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Invalid Pensions. H. R. 10332. A bill to grant pension for disability or death resulting from service in the United States Coast Guard before July 2, 1930, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2985). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 3619. An act relating to changes in the administration of the National Guard of the United States bearing on Federal recognition, pay, allotment of funds, drill, training, etc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2986). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 3266. An act to provide pensions, compensation, retirement pay, and hospital benefits for certain Air Corps Reserve officers who were disabled while on active duty with the Regular Army; without amendment (Rept. No. 2987). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 10527. A bill to provide for an extension of the conditions under which a money allowance for quarters may be paid to certain non-commissioned officers of the Army of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 2988). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 10391. A bill to increase the authorized numbers of warrant officers and enlisted men in the Army Mine Planter Service, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2989). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. S. 2627. An act pertaining to the Division of Investigation, Department of the Interior; without amendment (Rept. No. 2990). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9255) granting a pension to Asberry Risner, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 10573. A bill to amend title IV of the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WALLGREN:

H. R. 10574. A bill to provide for free treatment in Public Health Service hospitals of certain persons engaged in maritime employment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H. R. 10575. A bill providing for an examination and survey of Scarboro River, Maine, at a point between Prout's Neck and Pine Point, Maine; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. O'LEARY:

H. R. 10576. A bill to provide for marine training centers for the training and instruction of skilled personnel for shipbuilding and related industries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. R. 10577. A bill prohibiting Communists and members of the German-American Bund and of certain other organizations from working on national-defense contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROMJUE:

H. R. 10578. A bill to provide for automatic promotions of special clerks in first-class post offices from the first to the second grades; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 10579. A bill to amend the act of June 25, 1938, entitled "An act extending the classified civil service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution providing for safeguarding the national defense of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their memorial with reference to the death of the late Speaker William Bankhead; to the Committee on Memorials.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Dominican Republic, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their memorial with reference to the death of the late Speaker William Bankhead; to the Committee on Memorials.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Republic of San Salvador, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their memorial with reference to the death of the late Speaker William Bankhead; to the Committee on Memorials.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Republic of Peru, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their memorial with reference to the death of the late Speaker William Bankhead; to the Committee on Memorials.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Republic of Cuba, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their memorial with reference to the death

of the late Speaker William Bankhead; to the Committee on Memorials.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KELLER:

H. R. 10580. A bill for the relief of Bronislaw Babij and John Richert; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland:

H. R. 10581. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vashti Steffey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 10582. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Lively; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McLEOD:

H. R. 10583. A bill for the relief of Margaret Smiley; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

9324. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Hon. Jose Yulo, speaker of the National Assembly of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, transmitting a memorial with reference to the death of the late Speaker William Bankhead; to the Committee on Memorials.

9325. Also, petition of the California-Nevada Association of Lions International, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation as may be necessary to put an end to the subversive activities of agents of foreign powers, paid or otherwise; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

### SENATE

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1940

(Legislative day of Wednesday, September 18, 1940)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, Jesus Christ, who didst take upon Thee human childhood, content to be a swaddled baby in Thy mother's arms for the sake of little children; who didst not eschew the poverty and destitution of a manger for Thy birthplace, for the sake of all the poor and destitute; whose unblemished body on the tree was bared and broken not only to atone for sin but also for the sake of the downtrodden and oppressed: Look with Thy tender, loving pity, we beseech Thee, upon all innocent, suffering children, whose angels do continually behold Thy Father's face. Draw them close to the hearts that love them, that they may bring them to the shelter of Thine encircling arms, with hands that bless, where they may find protection both now and for eternity. We ask it for Thine own dear sake, who lovest beyond all human thought Thy little ones. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Thursday, September 26, 1940, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 10572) making supplemental appro-

priations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Ellender	Lodge	Shipstead
Andrews	Frazier	McKellar	Smathers
Ashurst	George	McNary	Smith
Austin	Gerry	Maloney	Stewart
Bailey	Gillette	Mead	Taft
Barbour	Green	Minton	Thomas, Idaho
Barkley	Guffey	Murray	Thomas, Okla.
Bulow	Gurney	Neely	Thomas, Utah
Burke	Hale	Norris	Tobey
Byrd	Harrison	Nye	Townsend
Byrnes	Hatch	O'Mahoney	Truman
Capper	Hayden	Overton	Tydings
Caraway	Herring	Pepper	Van Nuys
Chavez	Hill	Pittman	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Holt	Radcliffe	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	Hughes	Reed	Wheeler
Connally	Johnson, Calif.	Russell	White
Danaher	Johnson, Colo.	Schwartz	Wiley
Davis	Kling	Schwellenbach	
Downey	La Follette	Sheppard	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SLATTERY] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

#### SENATOR HENRY F. ASHURST

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be read from the desk a letter addressed to my colleague the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], and a resolution adopted by the State Senate of Arizona.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

PHOENIX, ARIZ., September 25, 1940.

HON. HENRY FOUNTAIN ASHURST,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR HENRY: At no time during my long service as secretary of the Arizona State Senate have I witnessed such manifest sincerity as was expressed by the senate members in adoption of the enclosed resolution. I certainly wish you could have heard the tribute paid you by many senators in expressing the wish that, as a mark of respect, the adoption of the resolution be by roll-call vote in lieu of the usual viva voce vote.

I wish to express my sentiment with an additional humble "aye" vote.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) BILLY GRAHAM,  
(W. J. Graham),  
Secretary of the Senate.

A resolution on the retirement of HENRY FOUNTAIN ASHURST from the Senate of the United States of America

Whereas the Honorable HENRY FOUNTAIN ASHURST, United States Senator from Arizona, will retire from the Senate of the United States of America at the end of the third session of the Seventy-sixth Congress; and

Whereas Senator ASHURST has represented this State in the United States Senate continuously since statehood, a period of 28 years; and

Whereas during all those years Senator ASHURST distinguished himself as a faithful public servant, steadfastly refusing to place selfish interests above the welfare of his country; and

Whereas Senator ASHURST will long be remembered by the people of the entire Nation for his statesmanship, his devotion to duty, his